DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 232 453 FL 013 827

AUTHOR Nichols, Patricia Diane Palmer
TITLE Accommodating Diverse Language Needs within an Intensive English Language Program: A Study of the English Language Institute at Alaska Pacific University.
PUB DATE 1 Apr 83
NOTE 115p.; Master's Thesis, Alaska Pacific University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Learning; College Second Language Programs; Educational Objectives; *English (Second Language); Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; *Intensive Language Courses; Language Enrollment; Postsecondary Education; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS Alaska (Anchorage)

ABSTRACT

The English Language Institute (ELI) at Alaska Pacific University provides an intensive academic program designed primarily to prepare foreign students for successful participation in undergraduate or graduate programs. Students from the local international community have also been admitted to the program. These students have motivations, language needs, and learning styles which differ from those of the university-bound foreign students. This thesis explores ways to serve better both groups without compromising their needs or the ELI program. The findings are derived from a literature review and from the ELI enrollment complexion, student opinions, and operating policies of other English language programs. Recommendations include (1) more stringent admission, placement, and progression policies; (2) a semi-intensive requirement; (3) consolidation of current classes into block courses; (4) restructuring the intensity of the ELI with a "split-week" program; and (5) provision of a "Community English" course, a no-credit nonacademic alternative to the ELI, to accommodate better those students for whom the established ELI program is inappropriate. In general, the recommendations provide for a tighter ELI program but also one which is better-defined and a more comprehensive language learning experience for all students. (Author/AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED232453

ACCOMMODATING DIVERSE LANGUAGE NEEDS WITHIN AN INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAM: A STUDY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE AT ALASKA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY

by

Patricia Diane Palmer Nichols, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Alaska Pacific University in Partial Fulfillment
of the requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE:

FL013827

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Palmer Nichols
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ALASKA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
Anchorage, Alaska
April 1, 1983

To

Yang and the Fishermen

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would never have been started or completed without the persistent encouragement and guidance of Dr. Marianne Inman, Director of the English Language Institute, who served as my Graduate Faculty Advisor and chairman of my committee. Dr. Inman believed in my need and ability to finish the Degree program when I began to feel otherwise. I sincerely appreciate the professional expertise, insight, support, and friendship she has shared with me. My gratitude also extends to Dr. Richard Dauenhauer, a member of my committee and one of my Graduate instructors. He patiently tolerated and answered my insistent questions, freed me from some cultural "boxes," and excited me about the inextricable link between language and culture. I am grateful also to Dr. Jan Ingram for serving on my committee and for initially drawing me into the MAT program.

I also wish to thank the ELI students whose struggles and successes with English provided the impetus for this thesis; Barbara Schatz and Bernie Blaine for their concern for the ELI students and their generous sharing of ideas; Keith Lawton and Connie Katasse for interviews; Kimi Slattery, Luz McDade, and Jai Cordell for translating; Marilyn Lewis, Diane Packard, Judy Clardy, Cyrette Sanford, and Kathy Howell for being my very special friends and giving me enthusiastic support during all phases of my Degree program.

I am most especially grateful to my husband and children for loving me through this effort and the disruption to family life . . . and to God for sustaining me throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES viii

LIST OF FIGURES ix

Chapter

1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

THE STUDY 8

Objectives 8

Methodology 9

Scope and Delimitations 11

Assumptions 11

Impact 12

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 13

INTRODUCTION 13

NEEDS OF ADULT LEARNERS 13

Introduction 13

Andragogy and Pedagogy 14

The Academic and Non-Academic Adult ESL Student . . 16

INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS 19

Introduction 19

Specific Characteristics of Intensive English Language Programs 20

Program Intensity 21

Page

Policies of Admission 21

Policies of Placement 24

Policies of Progression 27

Policies of Grading and Evaluation 29

SUMMARY 31

NOTES 32

3. FINDINGS 33

INTRODUCTION 33

STUDENT SURVEYS 33

STUDENT REGISTRATION FORMS 41

BROCHURES 41

SOLICITATION OF INFORMATION 48

SUMMARY 51

4. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION 52

INTRODUCTION 52

POLICIES OF ELI OPERATION 53

Introduction 53

Choice of Semi-intensive or Intensive Program . . . 54

Policies of Admission 61

Recommended Changes in Criteria for Admission . . . 62

Policies of Placement 63

Recommended Changes in Placement Policies 66

Progression Between Levels 66

Recommended Changes in Progression Policies 71

Page

Grading System 71

Recommended Changes in the Grading System 73

AN ELI ALTERNATIVE 73

A "SPLIT-WEEK" INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM 76

Introduction 76

Intensity of Instruction 77

Language Laboratory 79

Learning Resources Center 80

Interaction Between ELI Students and Teachers 81

Logistics of a "Split-Week" Program 85

Summary 86

CONCLUSION 86

APPENDIXES

A. STUDENT SURVEY #1--FALL, 1982 91

B. STUDENT SURVEY #1--SPRING, 1983 92

C. STUDENT SURVEY #2--FALL, 1982 94

D. STUDENT SURVEY #2--SPRING, 1983 95

E. SAMPLE LETTER FOR SOLICITATION OF INFORMATION 96

F. ILLINOIS ESL/ABE STUDENT FACT SHEET 97

G. ELI STUDENT FACT SHEET 98

H. ELI CONVERSATION EVALUATION 99

REFERENCE LIST 101

VITA

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	ELI Enrollment for 1982-1983 School Year	2
2.	Previous Education	39
3.	Previous Formal English Training	39
4.	Length of Time in the United States	40
5.	Part-Time and Full-Time Status	42
6.	IELP Brochures (1981-1982) Reviewed	44

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Proposed Block Arrangement of Classes	56
2.	Student Progress Sheet	70

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

The English Language Institute (ELI) at Alaska Pacific University plays a unique role in Alaska. It is the only intensive English language program specifically designed to meet the special language needs of university-bound foreign students. However, it is currently instructing two diversely motivated groups of students, and has therefore reached a point in its growth which necessitates an evaluation of entrance requirements, program design, and overall effectiveness.

When the ELI began in 1980, most of the students were recruited from overseas as F-1 students--those students possessing student visas for the expressed purpose of eventually pursuing undergraduate work at APU or other institutions of higher education. Since that time, however, the ELI has also been serving the language needs of an increasing number of adult learners from the local Anchorage international community; these students possess business, immigrant, or resident visas, or are United States citizens. Though most of these students do not intend to pursue further university study, they nevertheless comprised 52% of the ELI enrollment during the Fall, 1982 semester and 61% of the enrollment during the Spring, 1983 semester (Table 1).

While the university-bound students are predisposed to the academic requirements of an intensive university-level program (e.g. grades, assignments, tests, and regular attendance), an increasing number of the

community students are not. Although the learning styles and educational goals of some community students are incompatible with those of the more academically-oriented students, the presence of community students nevertheless adds a healthy cultural and social diversity to the entire language program. However, the situation does require a refocusing or a refinement of the ELI program as it is presently constituted because non-academic students in an academic program can work at cross-purposes and create a frustrating situation for both students and instructors.

My own experience as an ELI instructor for two years has provided the primary incentive for this study which explores ways to simultaneously and more effectively meet the language needs of both groups without compromising their particular motivations or the ELI program and its growing reputation.

Table 1

ELI Enrollment for 1982-1983 School Year

	Fall, 1982		Spring, 1983	
Total Enrollment	46		26	
F-1 Students	22	(48%)	10	(38%)
new	9		3	
continuing	13		7	
Community Students	24	(52%)	16	(61%)
new	19		10	
continuing	4		6	

BACKGROUND

ELI classes are offered on three levels: beginning, intermediate, and advanced. Within each level, there are five classes: Grammar, Conversation, Listening and Pronunciation, Reading, and Writing. Three additional classes are offered for the more advanced students: English Composition for International Students, TOEFL Preparation, and Introduction to American Society. Students are encouraged to enroll in regular university classes as soon as their language proficiency permits. For the most part, students take classes on only one level at a time. Ideally, students entering at the beginning level will be ready for university classes after three semesters.

There is currently a staff of five: the ELI Director who is a full-time faculty member, and four adjunct faculty members. Teaching schedules are arranged in order to expose the students to as many different forms of speaking and teaching styles as possible. Usually, students have the same instructor for the Grammar and Conversation classes but different instructors for each of the other classes. This is an advantage for the staff as well because it familiarizes them with all the students and therefore allows a more thorough assessment of progress.

Classes meet five days per week for fifteen weeks. They are small, with between three and fifteen students per class. Classes are traditional in that the teacher and curriculum essentially dominate the direction of the course. As a rule, teachers do not individualize instruction but rather seek to move the students as a group.

The ELI enjoys relative independence as a Special Program within the university framework. Curriculum and program decisions are internal

matters whereas recruitment and admission of students are under the auspices of the Registrar and Admissions Office.

Three expediencies have gradually resulted in the problem stated in the Introduction: 1) the admission of students who do not wish to pursue university study, 2) the lack of competency requirements for admission into the ELI, and 3) a decline in efforts to recruit foreign students due to institutional priorities.

The first ELI brochure stated that "the English Language Institute is designed especially to meet the needs of foreign students who wish to enter an American University program" and "applicants should have some competence in reading, writing, and speaking skills." A year later, a new brochure stated:

> The English Language Institute at Alaska Pacific University is designed to prepare foreign students who wish to enter American college or university undergraduate or graduate programs or to develop proficient use of English in a business or profession.

The addition of "to develop proficient use of English in a business or profession" does not in itself compromise the initial goal of the Institute, but it does essentially invite members of the local international community to participate in the ELI program. Many of these students do have the skills, learning styles and predispositions conducive to successful participation in an intensive academic program. Many, however, do not:

1. They do not possess adequate study skills necessary for formal instruction in an academic environment and do not know how to assume responsibility for their learning.
2. Habits of tardiness and irregular attendance disrupt the continuity of learning and the cohesion of the class.

3. Lackadaisical attitudes towards grades, assignments, and tests virtually make these types of assessments ineffectual.
4. Jobs and family priorities frequently interfere with attendance, completion of assignments, and students' taking more than one class.
5. There are increasing requests for a competency-based approach to instruction in which the progression of lessons is based more on "real-life" situations and communicative functions than on successively difficult grammatical patterns.

Additionally, in this later brochure, there is no mention of acquired competencies in English. Though this omission and its consequent "open to all applicants" policy has broadened the enrollment base, it has nevertheless compromised and weakened the program. The ELI curriculum was not designed to meet the language needs of students with little or no competence. Even the texts at the beginning level presume basic reading and writing skills. The staff is capable and qualified to instruct the truly beginning language learner, but university budget limitations have made it unfeasible to establish a class or level of classes to accommodate these students. Nevertheless, it is pedagogically unsound to put them in the same classes with students who have previously acquired skills in speaking, reading, and writing (Valette 1980:154). These students are therefore quickly frustrated, perhaps as much as the instructor who is trying to finish a particular lesson by the end of the semester to prepare the students sufficiently for advancement to the next level. Instruction frequently cannot proceed as anticipated because of much remedial work.

Concerted recruitment efforts are essential to maintain the integrity of the program. Because of the requirements of a young and growing university, other financial needs have taken precedence over the recruitment of foreign students. As shown in Table 1, there were 22 F-1 students enrolled in the Fall, 1982 semester, 9 of whom were new. Of the 10 F-1 students enrolled in the Spring, 1983 semester, only 3 were new. Should this particular short-sighted policy continue, the need for an academically-oriented English language program will indeed be questionable.

* * *

In my two years of teaching in the ELI, primarily at the beginning level, I have seen some of these trends and problems develop. In Spring, 1981, all four of my students were F-1 students with basic competencies in speaking, reading, and writing. Instruction proceeded as planned. In Fall, 1981, four of my six students were F-1 students. The two community students demonstrated sufficient skills and motivations to participate successfully in the academic class, but one was more academically-oriented than the other.

What was to be an extremely frustrating, but delightfully rewarding and challenging semester began in Spring, 1982. In a class of fourteen students, six had no acquired skills in English. Theirs was a unique situation, however, and they had enrolled as a group. Though their motivation and enthusiasm to learn rarely waned, they were unable ever to reach the skill level that the other students had had at the beginning of the semester. Certainly they learned, but it was intimidating and

embarrassing for them to receive low scores and experience slow progress; they frequently expressed to me that they felt foolish and stupid--like little children. Their grammar patterns virtually fossilized after six weeks because they had all obtained jobs and just could not find adequate time or need to process new patterns. Because of job schedules, they could not do required assignments and were frequently absent or too exhausted to pay attention in class. It was during this semester that I began to sense that the ELI program either needed to change or not accept students who could not adequately participate and experience a sense of accomplishment rather than continual failure.

Frustration set in again in Fall, 1982 because I was teaching a Grammar class to six community students, four of whom were clearly non-academic and had few if any oral or writing skills. Changing the text to accommodate learners' needs was not a permissible option. Nevertheless, two of the six students were highly motivated learners who were able to make substantial gains in the academic environment.

In the last two semesters described, all but three of the community students should have been in less intensive, more individualized, competency-based classes. Concern, creativity, and effort on my part were insufficient to bridge the disparity of skills needed for successful participation in the ELI program. Clearly, the ELI needs to refocus or refine its program and become more definitive and authoritative about its expectations and requirements.

THE STUDY

Objectives

In resolving the stated problem, some specific external areas of the ELI program will be evaluated with the intention of creating a more homogeneously motivated enrollment and a more consistent and effective operating framework. Those areas of concern are described as follows:

1. Choice of semi-intensive or intensive programs. Currently, all F-1 students are required by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to register for and successfully complete twelve credit hours (usually four courses) per semester. These are initially in the ELI unless or until language proficiency permits choices from the regular curriculum. Community students, however, may select individual courses on their particular levels. Since an intensive program is specifically designed to maximize the exposure to and learning of the language, this effort is compromised by a "pick and choose" approach. The feasibility of requiring these students to choose either an intensive program of 20-25 hours weekly or a semi-intensive program of 10-15 hours weekly will be evaluated.
2. Policies of admission and placement. Aside from the specific academic requirements necessary for obtaining F-1 status (a secondary education with a 2.5 GPA), admission to the ELI is otherwise open to all applicants with no stipulations as to English language proficiency or previous educational experience. The feasibility of reimposing such stipulations will be discussed.

3. Policies of progression from one level to another. Students have usually been advanced from one level to another simply because they have taken the previous one. However, some students should not be advanced in this manner because they cannot cope at the next level. Establishing the reputation and quality of the ELI requires that it be accountable for what it accomplishes and purports to accomplish. Therefore, the feasibility of using standardized tests or other formal measures to determine readiness for advancement will be considered.

4. Grading system. The university currently requires a traditional letter grading system in the ELI and there is no longer a "no-grade" audit option. Though the academic students are familiar and comfortable with letter or percentage grading and study accordingly, non-academic students find this system intimidating and embarrassing. It becomes an indicator of failure rather than an incentive for success. A more effective and acceptable grading/evaluation system will be discussed.

Additionally, some recommendations will be made for providing a broader and more relevant language learning experience for all students, thus increasing the program's effectiveness and credibility.

Methodology

To accomplish the above objectives, the following steps were taken:

1. Two questionnaires (Appendix A and C) were distributed to all ELI students enrolled in Fall, 1982 and to new students in Spring, 1983. The first questionnaire was designed to determine students' reasons for studying English, their reasons for specifically selecting the ELI at APU, those aspects of the program with which they were the most pleased, and their recommendations for improvements. The second questionnaire asked for information about their previous educational experience and previous exposure to English. The purpose of this questionnaire was to determine the diversity of enrollment and to acquire a feel for the backgrounds and skills students were bringing to the learning process.
2. Current brochures from forty other English language programs on the university-level were reviewed for the purpose of gathering information on workable and effective policies of program intensity, admission, progression, and grading.
3. Local language programs, national ESL organizations, and various agencies concerned with the education of international students were consulted and solicited for information, recommendations, bibliographies, or unpublished surveys relevant to the stated objectives.
4. Literature relative to the stated objectives was reviewed. Since English as a second language programs on the university-level have proliferated in the last ten years, only relevant literature primarily within this period was reviewed.

5. Recommendations for specific program changes were made based on personal observations and research findings.
6. Finally, a new ELI brochure was designed reflecting those recommended changes which were approved and implemented.

Scope and Delimitations

Curriculum and recruitment of foreign students are critical to the composition and effectiveness of the ELI program. Discussion of these topics, however, is not within the scope of this project for they constitute entire projects by themselves. This project will be limited, therefore, to those objectives which have been delineated.

Additionally, evaluations and recommendations will be limited to the English Language Institute at Alaska Pacific University.

Assumptions

Two main assumptions have guided the direction of and research for this project:

1. There is a real need for an intensive English language program in Alaska specifically designed to meet the needs of university-bound foreign students; the English Language Institute at Alaska Pacific University uniquely fills that role and should maintain the overall academic emphasis of its program.
2. Because of the intercultural and international image projected by Alaska Pacific University, its civic responsibility to serve the local Anchorage community, and its urgent need for students, blanket preclusion of local international stu-

dents from the ELI program is unacceptable, regardless of what their educational goals might be.

Impact

The primary impact of this study will be on the English Language Institute, refining it as needed to serve better those foreign students for whom it was first established and also those students from the Anchorage international community. It may also be of value to other intensive English language programs experiencing similar growth and faced with similar administrative decisions.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

As previously discussed, the ELI enrollment consists of two diversely motivated groups of students--the academically-oriented, university bound "foreign students" and the less-academically oriented "adult ESL learners" from the local community. Meeting the language needs of both groups within the same program is the focus of this study. Therefore, literature reviewed concerns the needs and education of adult ESL learners as well as the structure and functioning of intensive English language programs.

NEEDS OF ADULT LEARNERS

Introduction

The literature and educational practice specifically distinguish the "foreign student" from the "adult ESL learner" even though they are often the same age. Clearly, this distinction is based on differing motivations to learn English rather than the foreign student's non-adulthood. Nevertheless, I believe that all ESL learners eighteen and over should be accorded the status of "adult" whether they are actively involved in society and contributing to the economy, or whether they have had to suspend such involvement due to visa stipulations and educational goals.

This distinction has not merely been a semantic convenience. It unfortunately reflects and fosters fundamentally different approaches to language programs. Because of this, it is necessary that this discussion

precede a review of other literature more specifically related to the stated objectives.

Andragogy and Pedagogy

Malcolm Knowles, a specialist in adult education, recognizes this distinction as the essential difference between "pedagogical" and "andragogical" approaches to adult education. Whereas "pedagogy" initially referred to the controlled education of children, "andragogy" was coined by Knowles (1973) to refer specifically to the education of adults. Knowles uses the term to enforce his point that adults should not be educated in the same manner as children. He asserts that children require a "subject-centered approach" to learning with postponed application, whereas adults require a "problem-centered approach" based upon "developmental tasks required for the performance of . . . evolving social roles" (pp. 45-46).

Knowles believes that it is the role of the pedagogue to predetermine and subsequently control the education of the student, hence the conventional teacher-oriented and "subject-centered" systems of education in which students adapt themselves to the curriculum offered. He further asserts that our entire higher education system is pedagogic in its control of and demands on students--e.g. required courses and core curricula which do not necessarily reflect immediate and relevant needs or interests of the students; it assumes postponed application (p. 32).

Conversely, the role of the andragogue, according to Knowles, is to convey respect for adults by making use of their experience as a resource for learning, hence the student-oriented and "problem-centered" systems of education typically seen in Adult Basic Education programs in

which students aid in formulating the curriculum by specifying their language needs.

One of the basic assumptions in adult education theory is that any experience that is perceived by the adults as "putting them in the position of being treated as children is bound to interfere with their learning" (Knowles 1973:45). This is supported by those in the adult ESL field as well. Selman (1981:8) and Canzano and Canzano (1974:23) echo Knowles' belief that adults must be allowed to be self-directing. Lydon (1981:25) insists that teachers must be careful not to waste learners' time and that students must be given opportunities to assess language lessons and determine what was useful and what was not.

One of the reasons many adult ESL learners are easily subjected and submissive to pedagogic programs is that they do not know how to assume responsibility for their own learning and be self-directing. Knowles sees this as a problem even for those adults educated in the United States; they "don't know how to learn, only how to be taught" because traditional pedagogy conditions students to respond to teacher stimuli thereby limiting learning to the boundaries set by the teacher (p. 173). With regard to foreign students, Phillips and Shettlesworth (1978:28) concur that even though acceptance of responsibility for one's own learning is essential, it is "by no means easy for students whose experience derives from several years of authoritarian classroom methodologies." Therefore, cultural conditioning frequently prevents some adult ESL learners from taking the initiative. Nevertheless, Community Education programs, Continuing Education programs, and Adult Basic Education programs tend to accept and encourage this self-direction; regular college and university programs typically do not.

Canzano and Canzano (1974:23) warn that instructors of adult ESL learners must "repress the psychological parent impulse" even though the adult often acts like a child. Rivers (1964:91) states that we are asking these people to return to a very immature stage in their development:

> Now he is asked to practice strange sounds to fumble about with strange words and modes of expression, to follow blindly the lead of the teacher, . . . he is in danger of making foolish mistakes . . . you say not what you want to say but only what can be concocted from the few language forms you know.

Because of this linguistic immaturity, adult language learners are frequently treated like children.

But it is more often the foreign student than the community student who is regarded as a child. University-bound foreign students come primarily with needs and aspirations typical of university study which center mostly around linguistic survival in the classroom or library, and they seem less interested in general personal enrichment from their learning experience in a foreign country. Therefore, the language needs of these students appear to be more easily anticipated and predetermined, thus fostering a teacher-oriented program. However, because community students are daily identifying themselves in the community through their various roles, the formula for defining their language needs is not as simple; this fosters a student-centered program.

The Academic and Non-Academic Adult ESL Student

Whether the adult student is from the local international community or whether he has been recruited as an F-1 student, the primary distinction, I believe, should be "academic" or "non-academic." The literature suggests that the needs of both groups are sufficiently different to warrant separate classes or programs. "ESL students in academic

environments need different language skills than their non-academic counterparts. Therefore, it seems important to distinguish the extent to which different language skills (survival or academic) are required . . . " (Farhady 1979:170). Several skills-assessment studies have done precisely that.

One study which has clearly delineated necessary non-academic adult competencies is the Adult Performance Level Study conducted by Norvell Northcutt. Northcutt's group identified sixty-five competencies within four basic skill areas: communication, computation, problem-solving and interpersonal relationships. These skill areas were placed within five general knowledge areas: consumer, community resources, government and law, health, and occupational (Northcutt 1977). This study also served as the basis for a survey of adult ESL students in New Jersey (Bodman and Lanzano 1978:7). The purpose of this study was to determine if the APL results also reflected the needs of non-native English speakers.

Competency assessments have recently been conducted to determine the specific academic skills needed by university-bound foreign students. A study done at San Diego State University (Johns 1981) corroborates the findings of an earlier study done at the American Language Institute at USC (Ostler 1980). Both studies show that reading texts and listening to lectures, with the accompanying task of note-taking, ranked the highest among necessary academic skills. Asking questions in class and participating in class discussions were next. Writing compositions and research papers ranked below the need for oral skills. Johns concludes that teaching the productive skills of writing and speaking should be

secondary to the receptive skills of reading and listening (1981:56).

Krahnke (1981:4), on the contrary, advocates persistent use of communicative techniques in an academic program to encourage the development of oral skills. He states there is frequently resistance to this on the ground that such techniques "fail to address or involve the analytical sense that is asserted to be requisite for students in higher education." He also suggests (p. 7) that "language learning in general and continual learning of formal language skills and academic information processing abilities in particular require more global and less analytical abilities." Ostler (1980:501) advises that "ESL programs at the university level should be designed to prepare international students to compete on an equal basis with American students." Part of this "competitive equality" is the ability to be verbally creative and responsive.

Therefore, communicative and survival skills do have a place in an academic program, just as reading and writing skills have a place in a non-academic program. Particularly in an ESL situation such as that found in Anchorage, both academic and non-academic programs need to incorporate all four language skills:

> Students must be exposed to a variety of registers in English and must develop an ability to interact with a variety of native speakers in a variety of different circumstances. . . . Since greater English use is required of a student in an ESL context, emphasis must be placed on linguistic creativity and innovation and both academic and non-academic topics have to be introduced. (Judd 1981:63)

Nevertheless, as shown by the competency assessments, the stress on the four skills must be balanced to reflect the overall needs of the students.

Communicative proficiencies among academic and non-academic students differ because their motivations for learning English differ.

Academic students are more often "instrumentally" motivated and non-academic students are more often "integratively" motivated (Paulston 180:11)[1]. These two motivations for learning can conflict with one another in the classroom and interfere with learning.

Summary

Clearly, throughout this entire introductory section, relevance is the key word in the instruction of adult ESL learners, whether they are labeled "academic" or "non-academic," "community" or "F-1." Lydon (1981:58) says we need to "teach the student, not the language." In a task-oriented, semi-autonomous program, "students soon acquire the conviction that they are enriching themselves by being responsible for their own development." The success of such a system, however, depends on the willingness and readiness of teachers and students for change and innovation. But, as Judd (1981) states, motivation to learn will be high when the program and the instruction fit the needs of the students, and reflect their various adult needs for and uses of English; all involved in the teaching and learning process are more likely to succeed.

INTENSIVE ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Introduction

Daesch (1982:7) states as one of the conditions for effective operation of an intensive English language program (IELP) that its primary purpose must be "to teach college-bound foreign students the English language with an orientation to college life and culture in the U.S.," and it should "search out community language needs also if the program can accommodate" this additional service. An IELP must clearly identify

and define the population it is designed to serve because "a program cannot and should not attempt to satisfy specific objectives for everyone" (Buckingham 1981:20).

But no IELP will have an entirely homogeneously motivated group of students. There are always personal objectives which may or may not conflict with program objectives. Nevertheless, to insure accountability and credibility, the program must stipulate and maintain its objectives (Krahnke 1981). A program's success is measured "by the extent to which the legitimate purposes for which students enrolled are successfully accomplished" (Saltzer 1982:89). For the student and the program, "goals must be realistic, matching what is desirable with what is possible" (Kertis 1982:ii).

Specific Characteristics of Intensive English Language Programs

Barrett (1982:1-2) cites some specific characteristics of most IELP's:

1. Multileveled programs with respect to English proficiency
2. Standardized ESL tests used for initial placement and often as subsequent measures of progress
3. Recognition of the the four major language skills: listening speaking, reading, and writing
4. Service unit of a college or university
5. On-going program year around and tied to academic calendar of the parent institution
6. 20-30 hours of instruction per week
7. A variety of advisement services
8. Students are "adults with high school diplomas"
9. Director and core faculty professionally trained in ESL

Benseler (1979:9) states that an additional component of an IELP must be "constant feedback and evaluation." The rapid pace of instruction and lack of time for remedial work necessitates this in order to determine any learning problems.

Program Intensity

As just noted, most IELP's require 20-30 hours of in-class instruction per week. This does not usually include time spent in language laboratories, on homework, or participating in extra-curricular learning activities.

Benseler (1979) and Strevens (1977 b) concur that intensity can raise the effectiveness of the learning and teaching process. At its best, intensive instruction represents a more natural language learning situation. Benseler (11) advises, however, that optimal results are attainable only if the students are "willing, able, and sufficiently self-disciplined to commit the necessary time and energy."

Pimsleur further advises, however, that

> Human attention is limited. No one can absorb knowledge steadily for six hours a day, week after week; some of the time in intensive courses is necessarily "wasted" in relaxing, clearing one's mind, or plain day-dreaming. Moreover, things that seem confusing one day sometimes clear up by the next, after they have settled into place in one's mind. This "incubation" factor favors a non-intensive learning schedule. (1980:15)

Additionally, boredom and fatigue are real problems for students (and teachers) in an intensive program; this is particularly true with instruction above 20 hours per week unless special precautions are taken to vary materials and activities (Strevens 1977, Gewirtz 1979).

Policies of Admission

Careful selection of students is important to the credibility of an IELP. Only those students with "sufficient language proficiency to benefit from the instructional program" should be admitted (Robinett 1977:3). Neither the program nor the student benefit if this criterion is not a priority. The literature strongly advises that admission

requirements must coincide with program capabilities and objectives. The more extensive the program, the broader the requirements; the more limited the program, the more stringent the requirements.

"Open to all applicants" and "Open admissions" are the two most common policies of admission for IELP's. Though they appear to mean the same, they do not. "Open to all applicants" is the more inclusive of the two and, unless amended, means that a student must satisfy only the usual criteria for non-degree status or continuing education admission (Kertis, personal communication); these criteria usually do not stipulate language proficiency, prior formal instruction in English, or a secondary education. "Open admission," however, does include such stipulations. "Successful IELP's have established admission criteria regarding minimum age, previous education, and previous study of English" (Dakin 1982:15). For example, the most common admission requirement is that students must be at least seventeen years of age and a high school graduate (Dakin, Kertis 1982). Another common criterion is the completion of at least two years of high school English because "many programs do not pretend and indeed are usually not prepared to provide absolute beginning instruction" (Dakin 1982:16). As similar as these two terms are, prospective students and the admitting IELP share a dual responsibility for insuring a clear understanding of admission requirements.

The requirement of previous formal language instruction and at least a secondary education for admission into an academic program anticipates a productive transfer of previously learned skills and knowledge. Cummins (1980) hypothesizes that the cognitive/academic aspects of the first and second language are interdependent and that the development of proficiency in the second language is partially a function of first

language proficiency at the time when intensive exposure to the second language is begun. Because cognitive/academic language proficiency in the first and second language "are manifestations of the same underlying dimension, previous learning of literacy-related functions of language in the first language will predict future learning of these functions in the second language" (p. 179).

Furthermore, to require a certain level of language proficiency for admission into an academic program seems appropriate because "English language proficiency and academic success are inevitably linked" (Robinett 1977:2), even though "language proficiency alone does not signal success in the academic world" (CIEP 1981). Though Monshi-Tousi et al (1980:370) found that previous formal instruction of English in one's home country "may have a negligible effect on the eventual attainment of proficiency in English," Krashen (1978:261) maintains that "knowing how many years a person has studied English enables a more accurate prediction of a student's proficiency than knowing how long he has been living in an English speaking environment."

With regard to the secondary education requirement, students who have not graduated from high school in their own countries are likely to be easily hindered and intimidated by the necessary classroom procedures and requirements of an academic program. There simply is no time to acclimate them to such expectations in an intensive program if they have little or nothing to draw on.

A policy of "limited admissions" would impose further requirements such as specific scores on placement tests, nationality, sex, or whatever else the program chooses as a selection device. Such additional restrictions are common to programs which have insufficient funds or

facilities to operate more extensively (Buckingham 1981). This policy is driving more and more students away from university programs and into community colleges where costs and admission standards are lower. Nevertheless, the imposition of more stringent admission standards seems to be raising the caliber of university programs by attracting truly diligent and capable students.

Policies of Placement

Program objectives and capabilities are also important to consider with regard to the assessments used to determine placement. "Administrators in ESL programs should be willing to examine the correspondence between test items and instructional objectives" (Farhady 1982: 56). Since it is language proficiency which is measured, an academic program will necessarily require a different level of proficiency than a non-academic program. The literature therefore clearly advises the use of different kinds of measurements for academic and non-academic programs. Additionally, in an extensive language program, students can be first admitted and then placed according to their measured proficiencies. However, in a limited program, placement tests are often used first to determine admissibility and subsequently to determine placement.

In general, placement/proficiency tests identify:

1. persons linguistically prepared for enrollment into regular university programs,
2. persons needing special language training,
3. and "those who are so weak in English that the institution would not want to undertake a special program to remedy their deficiency" (Bowen 1977:295).

So, what does one say to the students who do not qualify for admission? It is here that professional decisiveness and tact must prevail.

Students must be encouraged to investigate other programs which can more appropriately meet their needs. While it seems incongruent for a language training program to turn away persons desiring language training and willing to pay for it, it is, as mentioned earlier, professionally unsound to admit students who cannot benefit from the instructional program.

The most common standardized placement tests used for academic programs are the MTELP (Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency), CELT (Comprehensive English Language Test), ALIGU (American Language Institute of Georgetown University), and the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) (Bowen 1977:295). For academic purposes, Angelis (1982:82) claims that the CELT is "the most widely used general proficiency test" with the MTELP "used as a general proficiency measure at the end of a session." The TOEFL is more often used as a measure to determine admissibility into a regular university program. Angelis further states that "program-related tests represent the best alternative to providing adequate meaningful placement measures" (p. 82). However, they do presume a fairly cohesive curriculum.

Farhady (1979:170) states that it is more often knowledge of the language rather than use of the language which is measured in standard language proficiency tests for academic programs. And because of this, students placed at the same program level may have diverse communicative abilities. He sees this as a flaw in using total scores on standardized tests as a basis for placing students, but notes that the trend is shifting from testing linguistic elements to testing communicative functions. There is also a trend to eliminate the "all-purpose" language test in

favor of using more specifically oriented measures. This trend in the academic realm of ESL coincides with recommendations by experts in the "adult ESL" field. Canzano and Canzano (1974) advise that students not be placed solely on one level but on different levels commensurate with their specific proficiencies in each of the skill areas.

Placement tests do not and cannot take into account first language background, innate linguistic ability, aptitude for study and degree of perseverence (Gewirtz 1979:178). These factors will create further diversity within a class even if placement scores are within the same range. Peck (1979:265) recommends that both an oral interview and a written test be used to supplement a standardized test in eliciting a more complete assessment of a student's proficiency. Oller (1979:46) additionally advises the use of dictation and cloze tests to meet the criterion of "pragmatic naturalness," not found in many standardized tests, which can better measure global proficiency.

Throughout the literature, the Ilyin Oral Interview has been the most frequently recommended measure of oral/aural proficiency. It can be of value in both academic and non-academic programs. The interview "is an integrative test that assesses an individual's ability to understand and speak intelligibly in a picture-controlled situation" (Ilyin 1976:M3). It is not, however, designed for people with little or no knowledge of oral English. Ilyin (M5) advises that her test be used in conjunction with a standard reading/writing test. It is entirely possible that a student would place at a beginning level on one test and an advanced level on the other. In a program where students are placed on only one level for all courses, Ilyin would advocate that this student

be placed on an intermediate level. However, Canzano and Canzano would recommend placing the student according to the separate scores.

Policies of Progression

In an IELP, progression from one level to the next is a built-in expectation. Since it is anticipated that students will persevere until completion of the highest available level, the curriculum is designed accordingly. Ideally, at the end of the program, the student will manifest substantial gains in language development, thus bringing credit to his own effort and to the program as well.

Progression virtually takes care of itself if admission and placement decisions are indeed based on a clear understanding of program expectations and objectives, strengths and limitations. Considerations applicable for placement, then, are equally applicable for progression.

It is imperative that progression decisions be based on what students can do rather than on what they know. "Simply to say that a learner has attended X number of classes for X number of hours may say little about his proficiency and . . . formal assessment of what has been taught may provide little information on the learner's actual proficiency outside the formal class" (Ingram 1979:6). Therefore, it is crucial that tests to be used in progression decisions assess what students can do with what they have learned.

It is unrealistic to assume that students will gain proficiency in all four skill areas at the same rate. And yet, students are usually advanced a level at a time. Canzano and Canzano (1974:7) maintain that "a student who is proficient in formal grammar skills, but deficient in

aural comprehension can advance to a high grammar level while persisting in mastering a lower level of listening comprehension; he does not have to achieve mastery in all areas at one time to progress." This is decidedly an andragogical rather than a pedagogical approach, but it does provide the student with a realistic and honest assessment of his proficiency and progress. If students are indeed retained, they should be assured that this does not mean they have "failed," but rather that they simply have not achieved sufficient skills for successful participation at the next level.

De Leon (1981:63) suggests that progression/retention decisions be based not solely on proficiency test scores at the end of each session. He suggests that the students' attitude and motivation be considered along with a file describing actual work done during the session. These considerations can balance out factors of "test fear" or "a bad day" which can cause poor performance on a test which is determining one's academic fate.

It is highly possible, however, that considering these additional factors in a progression/retention decision may account for a problem identified by Brown, who investigated the possibility of a difference in proficiency between students who have progressed through an IELP to intermediate or advanced classes and students initially placed in those classes (1980:111). He discovered that students placed directly into the advanced ESL classes at UCLA did better than those who were continuing students, concluding that this might "indicate a mismatch between the norm-referenced placement test (ESLPE) and the amount being learned in the course" (p. 116). The students in the lower level classes apparently

were not learning enough to earn the points which separate levels on the ESLPE (UCLA's ESL Placement Examination) and might very well not be placed at the next level if they had to take the test again. For this reason, a placement/proficiency test should be given at the end of each session to determine acquired proficiency and maintain equality within levels. Care must be taken however, to vary tests and test forms to keep instruction from becoming test-geared.

An IELP can succeed or fail on the basis of its policies of progression. Realistic but definitive policies will insure accountability and credibility.

Policies of Grading and Evaluation

"Once students have begun their language courses, their degree of motivation seems to be a function of their success in the course. For many second language students, motivation seems to decline in the face of difficulty" (Valette 1980:153). And much of this difficulty is a product of the grading system. Though F-1 students seem geared for academic competition, academically-oriented community students may not be. Indeed, as Selman (1981) contends, many adults prefer not to be evaluated and dislike being scolded or advised about their level of performance. Robinett (1977:7) adds that the use of discrete letter grades may sometimes be a problem since students often come from cultures in which personal failure is unacceptable. Students may muster every language processing tool they have available and still get an "F" or its equivalent. "Failing" can have a debilitating effect on continued motivation and eventually on self-esteem.

Alternative grading plans are available for use in IELP's in

addition to traditional letter or percentage systems. A program can simply declare itself "non-credit" and offer no grades. Verbal or written evaluation of progress would suffice. Cheng (1980:1) declares that such a program must, therefore, be "sufficiently interesting and relevant to student needs before it can compete for student time and attention." There is an obvious recognition here that grades are incentives for success. When they are removed, relevance and need must generate their own rewards.

Though grades are often not given for "non-credit" courses, some simple formalized system of evaluation might be desirable. "Pass-no pass" (Robinett 1977:7) or "pass-fail" (Tharu 1973:46) systems are two such options. In a "pass-fail" system, "fail" essentially means that the student must undergo the course again in its entirety or in a tutorial version, whereas "pass" simply means that the student can proceed to the next higher level of instruction. No matter what efforts are used to soften the harshness of "fail," it nevertheless has a persistent negative connotation. Therefore, it seems that "pass-no pass" would be far less threatening even though it means entirely the same thing as "pass-fail."

Kessler (1974) contends that if grades cannot count towards a student's overall GPA, they should not be given. She designed an IELP for Immaculata College in Washington D.C. in which students do receive academic credit for their ESL work and their IELP grades are therefore included in their final GPA's. Additionally, other programs offer the students a "credit-no credit" option through which students can choose to be graded or not graded.

The process of evaluation can be a very delicate matter for any adult ESL learner, whether from the community or recruited as an F-1 student. At some point in their maturity, many adults begin to resent letter grades affixed to what they know or do not know; they know what they already know and what they still need to learn in order to accomplish their particular goals. Grades, therefore, more often tend to serve the needs of the institution than the personal needs of the adult learner.

SUMMARY

The literature shows that an intensive English language program can be workable and beneficial to all students only if the needs of all adult learners in the program are considered in conjunction with the specific functional needs of the program. Whether an IELP is academic or non-academic in emphasis, the curriculum offered must meet the language needs of a clearly defined population. Students for whom the program is inappropriate must be directed to another program which better meets their needs. For an IELP to truly maximize the language learning experience, goals and objectives must be clear and the strengths and limitations of the program must be known. Within a firm and consistent program, students can be given both the latitude to assume responsibility for their own learning and the necessary structure in which to acquire linguistic proficiency.

NOTES

[1]Paulston uses Wallace Lambert's terms here. "Instrumental" refers to the learning of English for a particular purpose or function: a better job, to acquire social prestige within a particular group, or to pursue educational goals. Instrumentally-oriented students, therefore, pursue language training as a means to an end and try to learn the language without absorbing the culture it creates or reflects. "Integrative," on the other hand, refers more to desires for assimilation within the target culture; the actual language learning process itself is regarded as an assimilative experience. These students are eager to acquire communicative competence and associate with native-English speakers.

Chapter 3

FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents and discusses information gathered from the following: two different surveys each distributed to ELI students during the Fall, 1982 and Spring, 1983 semesters; registration forms for students enrolled during the Fall, 1982 and Spring, 1983 semesters; forty current brochures representing other English language programs on the university level; and the specific solicitation of information from local English language programs and professional organizations concerned with the education of international students.

STUDENT SURVEYS

As previously stated, the enrollment of community students in the Fall, 1982 semester was 52% of the total ELI enrollment and 61% in the Spring, 1983 semester (Table 1). I was therefore interested in knowing why these particular students had chosen the APU program over other less expensive, less intensive, and less academically demanding ESL programs in Anchorage. Additionally, I wanted to know students' opinions about the ELI program and their particular motivations for studying English. I had hoped that responses would be useful in making recommendations for program changes which would better serve all ELI students. Student Survey #1 (SS1) was designed to elicit this information (Appendixes A and B).

Furthermore, it was readily apparent that ELI students varied in

their previous exposure to English and their years of education. As previously mentioned, both these factors greatly influence a student's processing ability and success in a formal language learning situation. This information had not been previously obtained for most of the students. Student Survey #2 (SS2) was therefore designed to determine what educational and language experience students were bringing to the learning process (Appendixes C and D). This information will be useful in determining the feasibility of establishing minimum competency and education levels for ELI admission.

Survey Sample

There were 46 students enrolled in the ELI during the Fall semester and 26 students enrolled in the Spring semester. During the Spring, 13 students were continuing students and 13 were new. From the Fall survey distribution, 35 SS1's and 37 SS2's were returned. Of the Spring surveys distributed to new students only, 8 of each were returned.

Procedure

Surveys were distributed to students during the sixth week of classes in the Fall and during the fourth week of classes in the Spring. Students were asked not to put their names on SS1 to allow for anonymity and freer expression. To further make it easy for students to respond to SS1, they were permitted to answer questions in their own languages. The assistance of three translators was obtained to translate the responses from Korean, Japanese, and Spanish into English. Since SS2 requested specific information about education and language background and was to be later placed in the students' files, names were requested.

Results from Student Survey #1

Question II--"Why do you want to study English?" Three probable reasons for studying English were listed with an option to write in a fourth reason. On those surveys distributed in the Fall, students were asked to rank these reasons in order of personal importance. Directions were misunderstood and/or poorly written because only a few students ranked all the choices as directed, and some students ranked two or more choices with the same number. To make responding easier, the ranking method was modified on those surveys distributed in the Spring. Rather than rank choices in order of importance, students were now asked to rate each of the choices on a scale of 1-9 as to its importance. This method seemed to be equally as confusing as the first. Choices were either unrated or rated the same. The only clear pattern which emerged from both surveys was that most F-1 students ranked or rated "getting an education" their first or most important reason for studying English. Ranking or rating personal reasons for studying English could have been an entirely new experience for some of the students as well as a virtual impossibility.

Question IIIA--"Why did you choose the English Language Institute at APU?" This question did not clearly elicit the information anticipated. Most responses were vague and did not pertain to the question; more frequently, reasons for studying English were given. Of particular interest to me was why the ELI at APU had specifically been chosen over other programs available in Anchorage. This question was amended on the Spring survey to include " . . . instead of another program in Anchorage." Even with this additional phrase to clarify the intent of the question,

answers continued to be vague. It was entirely possible that many students were unaware of other programs. Nevertheless, three particular responses did occur with some frequency: 1) the ELI was chosen because of its separate classes in each of the skill areas, 2) the program had been selected for the student by a sponsor or relative, and 3) the program had been selected because of small class size.

Question IIIB--"What do you like best about the English Language Institute program?" This question generated more responses describing favorite classes than particular aspects of the program. However, the separation of classes by skill areas and the small number of students in each class were again mentioned here. One student expressed that he was impressed with the Learning Resources Center although he had no idea how to utilize this facility. Fuller utilization of the Learning Resources Center by ELI students will be discussed in Chapter 4 as there is great potential here for expanding and improving the entire ELI program.

Question IIIC--"What changes do you think would make the English Language Institute program better?" This question elicited few criticisms of the program. Most students were either reluctant to offer such comments or had none. One student, however, did complain about the starting hour of 8:30 A.M., and several F-1 students complained about the intensity of the program: "I think that 5 classes a day is difficult for most students to study"; "I think that this program is too much. So we hope that the class had better reduce if you can"; "You have too many classes. After 3 classes, I feel to tired and bore. That time I really want to die. I want to take about 3 classes. You must think about my idea." These comments about the intensity of the program are especially

pertinent to this study. There is evidently not a clear understanding by F-1 students of the word "intensive" or of the conditions of their student visa. Recommendations for restructuring the intensity of the program for the expressed purpose of alleviating boredom and burnout will be made in Chapter 4. One of the more perceptive responses to this question was the following (as translated): "It would be more interesting if the professors would plan activities that would integrate more of the students; it is an excellent way to upgrade conversation." Recommendations to do just this will be discussed in Chapter 4. Also dealt with in the next chapter will be one student's criticism that the ELI is not using the language laboratory as part of its program.

Comments Pertaining to Student Survey #1

The experience of responding to a questionnaire may very well have been unfamiliar and somewhat uncomfortable for many students. Additionally, it may not have been culturally acceptable to express personal opinions or make criticisms about the educational program they are participating in. For other students, there was simply the lack of language needed to understand the questions and provide adequate and usable answers. However, I sensed that students did appreciate the opportunity to express their opinions and to have a say in their program.

A peripheral and yet important result of this questionnaire came by way of observations made by two of the three translators regarding responses on the Fall surveys. They singled out two Colombian students and one Korean student whose written responses, in their native language, were very ungrammatical and "obviously uneducated." Though their names

Six of the students, however, had either not attended any high school or had not completed high school. Survey results show that many community students have had as much education as the F-1 students.

Table 2

Previous Education

	F-1 Students	Community Students
No high school	0	3
Incomplete high school	1	2
High school, but no college	8	7
High school, and some college	12	12

Table 3

Previous Formal English Training

	F-1 Students	Community Students
None	1	3
1-3 years	3	6
4-6 years	9	9
Over 6 years	8	6

Table 3 shows the previous formal English training of the students. Most students had from 4-6 years of formal training with many having more than six years. But, as two students indicated on their surveys, these years of studying English were filled mostly with grammar and vocabulary exercises rather than any realistic conversation practice; therefore, their communicative ability was very poor in comparison to their reading and writing.

Table 4 indicated the length of time these students had been in the United States at the time of the survey. As expected, the community students had been here the longest, and most of the F-1 students had been here less than a year.

Table 4

Length of Time in the United States

	F-1 Students	Community Students
Under 1 year	16	8
1-2 years	5	10
3-5 years	0	2
6-10 years	0	1

Comments Pertaining to Student Survey #2

With regard to student performance in the ELI, it appeared that neither years of education nor length of time in the United States gave students a decisive advantage over one another. Rather, with the

exception of a couple of students, it was previous formal training in English which seemed to provide that advantage. However, based on my own personal observations and comments from collegues, high motivation to learn was the equalizer among F-1 students and community students regardless of education, previous formal training in English, or length of time in the United States.

STUDENT REGISTRATION FORMS

Registration forms for ELI students enrolled in the Fall, 1982 and Spring, 1983 semesters were reviewed to determine: 1) which students were new or continuing, 2) which students were enrolled in the ELI part-time or full-time, and 3) how many classes each student was taking. Twelve credit hours (a minimum of four classes) constitutes full-time enrollment. Although F-1 students are required to be enrolled in the ELI full-time unless or until their language proficiency allows for choices from the regular curriculum, registration forms revealed that many community students enrolled full-time as well. Table 5 indicates how many students were part-time and full-time and the number of classes they were enrolled in. This information is essential in determining whether it is feasible to require community students to enroll in an intensive or semi-intensive program each semester.

BROCHURES

Current brochures from forty different university-level English language programs were reviewed. Many of the brochures represented programs operated through Continuing Education Departments and the others represented language programs or institutes existing as separate

Table 5

Part-time and Full-time Status

	Fall, 1982	Spring, 1983
F-1 Students		
Total enrolled	22	10
Part-time	6	4
1 class	1	3
2 classes	3	0
3 classes	2	1
Full-time	16	6
4 classes	1	1
5 classes	14	2
6 classes	1	3
Community Students		
Total enrolled	24	16
Part-time	17	15
1 class	10	9
2 classes	7	6
3 classes	0	0
Full-time	7	1
4 classes	0	0
5 classes	7	1
6 classes	0	0

entities within a university structure. With regard to the stated objectives, there were a number of consistencies among the programs described which provide clear and usable quidelines for program changes in the ELI. Brochures reviewed are shown in Table 6.

Those programs which were the most specific about their objectives and requirements appeared to be also the largest. This is not the place, however, to discuss whether these programs grew because of their diligent adherence to specific requirements or whether their growth freed them to be insistent and selective.

Program Intensity

Those programs describing themselves as "intensive" characteristically require 20-30 hours of class time per week for sessions ranging from four to fifteen weeks. A consistent practice is that all students, whether F-1 or community, enroll in a program of study and pay accordingly for the block of classes available on their particular levels. Justification for requiring students to enroll in a complete full-time session is not offered by these programs, but it seems that this policy 1) keeps the entire program functioning each session, 2) provides consistency and therefore stability, 3) insures that only persons serious about language learning will enroll, and 4) provides program dollars that might not otherwise be available if a "pick-and-choose" approach were allowed. Table 6 indicates those IELP's offering block programs.

Some of these programs do have part-time options available. The Ohio Program of Intensive English at Ohio University requires beginning and intermediate students to take a full-time load but allows advanced students a 10-15 hour week. The American Language Program at Columbia

Table 6

IELP BROCHURES (1981-1982) REVIEWED

Location	Secondary Ed. required	Language Profiency	Block Program
University of Texas, Austin	yes/or 18	no	yes
Santa Ana College, California	no	CELT 30+	---*
The American Univ., Washington D.C.	---	---	yes
Tennessee Tech University	yes	no	yes
Georgia Institute of Technology	yes	TOEFL 300	yes
Lewis-Clark State College, Idaho	---	---	yes
Barry College, Florida	yes	no	yes
University of Colorado	yes	no	yes
Tulane University	no	no	yes
University of South Florida	yes/or 18	no	yes
St. Mary's College, California	yes	TOEFL 500	yes
Columbia University	yes	no	yes
University of Michigan	yes	no	yes
Gonzaga University, Washington	no	TOEFL 350	yes
Ohio University	---	TOEFL 440	yes
State University of New York, Buffalo	yes	"suitable"	yes
University of Louisville, Kentucky	yes	no	yes
Northwestern State Univ. of Louisiana	yes	---	yes
Citrus College, California	yes	TOEFL 500	---
University of Pennsylvania	2 years	no	yes
Southern Illinois University	no	no	yes
Drake University, Iowa	yes	TOEFL 450	yes
Sonoma State University, California	yes	no	yes
University of Kentucky	no	no	yes
Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium, Ohio	yes	no	yes
Brigham Young University	no	TOEFL 500	yes
Univ. of Calif., Berkeley	yes	no	yes
Univ. of Calif., Davis	no	no	yes
Univ. of Calif., Santa Barbara	yes	no	yes
Univ. of Calif., Los Angeles	---	---	yes
Univ. of Calif., Riverside	---	no	yes
Univ. of Calif., San Diego	yes	some	yes
Univ. of Calif., Irvine	yes	no	yes
Univ. of Calif., Santa Cruz	---	---	yes
University of Hawaii, Manoa	yes	no	yes
University of Nevada, Reno	yes	no	yes
George Washington Univ., Wash. D.C.	yes	no	yes
Arizona State University	yes	no	yes
Seattle Pacific University	yes	---	---
Pennsylvania State University	yes	no	yes

This table represents information derived only from the brochures.
*(---) This information was vague or not included in the brochure.

University has full-time and part-time options, but it involves two simultaneous programs. Part-time students are not in classes with full-time students. And within the part-time program itself, students have a choice of attending 5 hours per week or 10 hours per week. Furthermore, those students coming 5 hours per week are in separate classes from those students coming 10 hours per week. This program clearly recognizes the diverse learning styles and motivations of its students and the incongruity of placing a 5-hour-per-week student in a class of full-time students.

Policies of Admission

Representative of most introductory statements in the brochures is this composite: "Only those mature adults with serious intent who can devote their full time to rigorous language training should apply." The key words, "mature adults," "serious intent," "full time," and rigorous language training" occurred over and over again, clearly stating for prospective students the nature of the program and for whom it is appropriate. St. Mary's College in California further adds that theirs is a program "dedicated to the principles of academic excellence."

The Ohio Program of Intensive English at Ohio University wisely offers the following disclaimer in its brochure: "Beginning classes are not intended for absolute beginners. Because all instruction is in English, students must have enough prior knowledge of English to benefit from participation in this type of intensive study." The English language programs at Georgia Institute of Technology and Gonzaga University echo this philosophy. The University of California at San Diego is more

specific in its similar disclaimer: "Previous English language study is recommended for those enrolling in the intensive English Language Program. Persons who can understand simple questions and statements and who can ask and answer questions about daily personal needs and familiar topics will benefit most from the course."

These programs obviously have clear objectives and an awareness of their strengths and limitations. This awareness provides stability and continuity to a program and fosters its credibility and a commitment to accountability. These disclaimers may turn away some needed dollars, but, in the long run, the program will gain a reputation for quality and, in turn, will draw the students it is designed to serve.

As shown in Table 6, most IELP's described in the brochures require a secondary education in addition to the maturity and full-time involvement of students.

Policies of Placement

All programs described in the brochures required admitted students to take placement tests. These are either "in-house" or standardized instruments. Some programs use a battery which combines both and often includes an oral interview as well.

Placement tests are designed to determine a student's language proficiency and thus the appropriate level of instruction. The brochures were consistent in indicating that students would be placed on one particular level. There appeared to be no options for taking different classes on different levels within the same session. Though placing students on one level for all classes is by far the most common and efficient practice, it may very well not be the most realistic.

Some programs have no minimum cut-off score on placement tests because there are sufficient levels to accommodate zero-to-minimal-skill learners. The American Language Program at Santa Ana College in California, however, does have a CELT cut-off score of 29. Those scoring 29 or below are encouraged to participate in the Continuing Education program which is apparently less intensive and academically demanding. Then, when these students achieve 30 or above, they can be admitted into the more intensive academic program. Similarly, as shown in Table 6, several other programs require specific TOEFL scores for admission because these IELP's cannot accommodate students below a certain level. Like the admission disclaimers cited earlier, these restrictions strengthen these programs' accountability and credibility. If they are not designed to accommodate zero-to-minimal-skill learners, IELP's are professionally obligated to detour such students to other more appropriate programs via strict admission policies or enforced cut-off scores on placement tests.

Policies of Progression

The ESL Program at Barry College stipulates, "When a student begins a level, he will be expected to successfully complete that level before going on to the next one." What does "successfully" mean and how is it determined? No answer was given in that brochure, but other programs administer comprehensive exams at the end of each session and base progression on the attainment of minimum scores established for each level.

Likewise, retention is also based on these scores. Several brochures indicated that if there is no improvement in skills at the end

of a session, students would be retained. If, at the end of the second session on the same level, there is still no discernible improvement, students are asked to leave the program. Such programs obviously attract adequate numbers of students and are not willing to waste time, money, and program reputation on students who will not (or cannot) progress. The English Language Program at UCLA further stipulates in its brochure that "students are expected to take active responsibility for their own learning," implying that a program, no matter how well designed, cannot do for students what they will not (or cannot) do for themselves.

The University of California at San Diego requires, however, "no set time for progressing through these levels. Individual experience with English, attitude, and motivation will determine the speed with which learning takes place." Similarly, the American Language Program at Columbia University allows students to progress through the sequence at their own rate of achievement. These policies more clearly resemble the views of Adult Basic Education programs than those of most university programs.

Grading

Unfortunately, systems of grading were not presented or discussed in the brochures.

SOLICITATION OF INFORMATION

Information from Local Programs

I am grateful for the cooperation of personnel from two of the local English language programs. I had very pleasant and informative

conversations with Connie Katasse of Anchorage Community College and Keith Lawton of the Adult Learning Center.

Katasse stated that ACC did not really provide a program as such, but rather three to five classes covering speaking and writing skills. Admission is open to all applicants who are eighteen or over and/or have a secondary education. Placement in the program is voluntary or recommended on the basis of low scores received on a general placement test given to all entering students. Placement in a particular ESL class is at the discretion of the student or as recommended by a counselor. Katasse did mention, however, that if students fail to heed her recommendations about class selection, they are sternly warned by her that if they cannot "cut it," they will be out of the class; the classes are large and could afford to be smaller. The ESL classes are primarily academic in emphasis but not as intense as those at APU; classes meet twice a week for two hours.

With much frankness, Katasse advised me to encourage a tighter and more specifically defined program at APU lest it collapse from attempting to meet the language needs of too many different kinds of students. I owe the idea of a "Split-Week" instructional program for the ELI to Katasse. This program will be presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

The Adult Learning Center is, according to Lawton, a competency-based program able to individualize instruction and meet both the academic and non-academic needs of its students. This program does have some classes on different levels but, for the most part, they are quite heterogeneous. Instruction is free at ALC and students can enter and

exit as they choose within the semester. Lawton does not feel that this "Open Entrance-Open Exit" policy is detrimental to his instruction or to the progress of the students; as a matter of fact, he says it is "ideal." Though no grades are given, Lawton has a "feeling for assessment" and can give his students rather accurate progress reports.

According to Lawton and Katasse, neither program is in competition for students with APU. They do not specifically recruit F-1 students (though some do attend the ACC program) and would prefer to meet the needs of the local international community. Both were encouraging as I discussed possible changes in the ELI program with them. They both felt there is a need for the intensive academic program offered by the ELI.

Information from National Organizations

Solicitation of information from national and professional agencies concerned with the education of international students was disappointing. My letters brought only a few feeble responses which virtually ignored the specific information requested (Appendix E). I therefore inferred from the responses that the ELI essentially needs to solve its own particular problems per its specific needs and available resources. There appears to be an insufficient sharing of information regarding particular program designs among the programs themselves and between the programs and the representative national and professional organizations and agencies.

SUMMARY

Using information gleaned from the above sources, Chapter 3 has described the enrollment complexion of the ELI, students' opinions about the ELI program, and the operating policies of other intensive English language programs. These findings will be considered in conjunction with the literature in making recommendations for changes in the ELI program. Theory, practice, and need must now come together in a realistic and workable manner.

Chapter 4

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

INTRODUCTION

The recommendations presented in this chapter represent the culmination of research findings, students' comments, suggestions from colleagues, my own opinions, . . . and some wishful thinking. During the course of this project, many of these recommendations were discussed with colleagues and weighed in the light of need and feasibility; a few have already been initiated. Many of these recommendations for changes in the ELI can be easily and immediately implemented while others may require a more gradual approach. Nevertheless, they all serve to create a more comprehensive and better-defined language program which can more effectively accommodate the language needs of all the adult language learners coming to APU--those from the local community as well as those from overseas. Furthermore, recommendations are designed to promote a workable balance between andragogical considerations and the necessary functional needs of an intensive English language program. These recommendations will be grouped and discussed as follows:

1. Recommendations pertaining to the external framework of the ELI--policies of program intensity, admission, placement, progression, and grading.
2. Recommendations pertaining to the formation of an alternative to the ELI program which can better accommodate those learners not desiring the intensity or academic emphasis of the

regular ELI curriculum and those learners who are inadmissible to the ELI.

3. Recommendations pertaining to the formation of an ELI "Split-Week" instructional program designed to alleviate student boredom and burnout and more fully utilize the facilities of the Learning Resources Center to the advantage of the entire ELI enrollment.

POLICIES OF ELI OPERATION

Introduction

Changes in some of the external operating policies of the ELI program are being proposed in order to encourage a more homogeneously motivated enrollment, create a more consistent operating framework, and consolidate instructional effort. Since its beginning, the ELI has had to make different administrative and curriculum responses each semester to changing enrollments. These fluctuations have hindered program consistency, cohesion, and continuity. Though external operating policies are somewhat peripheral to curriculum decisions, they nevertheless influence curriculum by shaping the enrollment. Therefore, if these policies are consistent, well defined, and directed toward the same end, the enrollment will become more predictable, thus making curriculum choices clear and the program more cohesive.

Those areas previously delineated as focal points of this study will be discussed in the following order: choice of semi-intensive or intensive program for community students, policies of admission, policies of placement, policies of progression, and systems of grading.

Choice of Semi-intensive or Intensive Program

As previously shown in Table 5, the ELI enrollment consists of many part-time students. Though F-1 students more often initially enroll in the ELI full-time, they eventually become part-time as their language proficiency permits them to phase into the regular curriculum. However, most community students initially enroll as part-time students and usually select only one or two classes. Though this "pick and choose" approach to language learning may necessarily be governed by time and financial constraints, it nevertheless contradicts the rationale of an intensive language program--to maximize exposure to the language and opportunity for its use. Fifty minutes of actual class time a day hardly approaches this goal. Even those IELP's offering part-time options require ten to fifteen hours per week.

Those students enrolled in only one course per week miss out on the development of relationships with other students that can foster increased incentive for language use. I have personally observed the growth of relationships among those students who attend two or more consecutive classes and do not speak the same native language. There is much carry-over from class to class; the trust and confidence which build among them encourages a natural use of English far beyond the demands of any one class. Thus, formal language training becomes synergistic, and it is at this point that it ceases to be a mere commodity.

For this reason, and to encourage the continuity and growth of the entire program, I recommend that the ELI require community students to enroll in a semi-intensive program. This recommendation not only approaches the enrollment requirements for the F-1 students, but it

would also provide an increased sense of cohesion to the program and among all the students.

Though requisite full-time enrollment in the ELI for all students is far more desirable and consistent with the practice of most other IELP's, it is incompatible with our local community needs and is therefore unrealistic at this time. Most community students who enroll in the ELI are eager language learners, but they must schedule classes between jobs, during a job, or around family schedules. Most of them simply do not have time for full-time class attendance or the accompanying workload. Furthermore, with the availability of other language programs, the Anchorage international community could not support or sustain a full-time requirement at APU. Until the recruitment of foreign students increases and becomes more reliable, the ELI needs community students to offset periodic declines in F-1 enrollment. A full-time requirement would quickly jeopardize or eliminate this needed enrollment base.

Therefore, by rescheduling existing classes into two or three integrated block courses, community students could be eased into a semi-intensive program of ten or fifteen hours per week. Such a block arrangement reflects the specific language needs of both community and F-1 students. Most community students prefer to develop primarily their proficiency in listening and speaking skills, while the university-bound F-1 students prefer to develop their proficiency in grammar, reading, and writing. The ELI staff, however, would prefer that all students develop equal proficiency in all the skill areas; the block arrangement functions toward that end.

		BEGINNING	INTERMEDIATE	ADVANCED	
Monday to Friday 9:00 - 12:00	#1	Grammar Reading Writing (9)	Grammar Reading Writing (9)	Grammar Reading Writing (9)	TOEFL Preparation (3)
	#2	Grammar Reading Writing (9)	Grammar Reading Writing (9)	Grammar (3) / Reading Writing (6)	Composition for International Students (3)
	#3	Grammar (3) / Reading Writing (6)	Grammar (3) / Reading Writing (6)	Grammar (3) / Reading Writing (6)	Introduction to American Society (3)
Monday to Friday 1:00 - 3:00		Conversation Listening Pronunciation (6)	Conversation Listening Pronunciation (6)	Conversation Listening Pronunciation (6)	

Figure 1

Proposed Block Arrangement of Classes

As shown in Figure 1, the semi-intensive requirement could be implemented using one of the three following configurations:

1. Students have the option of choosing either a three-hour morning block of classes (15 hours per week) or a two-hour afternoon block of classes (10 hours per week) . . . or both. The morning three-hour block (GRW) would consolidate the current Grammar, Reading, and Writing classes into one course under one title and be accorded nine credit hours. The afternoon two-hour block (CLP) would consolidate the current Conversation and Listening/Pronunciation classes into one course under one title and be accorded six credit hours. Each of these blocks would be available at the Beginning, Intermediate, and Advanced levels and would be taught by a single instructor.

Or, 2. Students have the same options as described for #1 except that only the Advanced Reading and Writing classes would be consolidated into one course and accorded six credit hours. Grammar would remain a separate course of three credit hours, thus allowing students at this level to separately select Grammar and/or TOEFL Preparation as their needs and proficiency dictate.

Or, 3. Students on all levels would have the option of choosing Grammar and/or an RW block in addition to or instead of the CLP block.

The grouping of classes into blocks of similar skills in no way eliminates conversation from the GRW block or reading and writing from the CLP block. Students cannot expect to avoid participation in class

discussions by enrolling in the GRW block, nor can students in the CLP block expect to avoid using a text or having an occasional written assignment. All five subject areas will necessarily be part of each block, but the main emphasis of each block will be on its designated skill areas. Both blocks will maintain an overall academic emphasis, primarily seeking to prepare students for successful participation in a regular university program.

TOEFL Preparation, Introduction to American Society, and Composition for International Students, the three remaining ELI courses, would not be subject to a block schedule although they could be offered concurrently with one of the blocks. These courses would continue to function for those students who have completed the other Advanced courses or who can demonstrate sufficient competency for successful participation. Those students proficient enough to enroll in these courses could continue to do so on a class-by-class basis. There is the possibility, however, that the TOEFL Preparation course could appropriately replace the grammar component of the Advanced GRW block and become an integrated part of that block.

Though several students indicated on Student Survey #1 that they prefer the separation of skills into separate classes, I feel that the proposed blocks are compatible with that preference. Furthermore, one of my colleagues, Barbara Schatz, has long preferred a consolidated instructional block, especially for Beginning level students. Schatz has felt that these students neither prefer nor require the separation of skills and would benefit from the consistency that one class and one instructor can provide. She also feels that an instructor in a

consolidated block can better integrate all the skills being newly acquired. We agree, however, that these blocks should not be more than three hours long with one instructor. Having taught three separate but consecutive Beginning classes comprised of virtually all the same students, I can share Schatz's preference for a block course. In that situation, I treated the three classes essentially as an integrated block and found it to be a beneficial and productive approach, especially for those Beginning students.

The CLP block would continue to develop communicative competence, refine pronunciation, and sharpen listening skills. The academic needs of the F-1 students necessitate more the development of critical and attentive listening skills, while the less academic and greater social needs of the community students necessitate more the development of functional communicative skills; nevertheless, this block will appropriately and effectively serve the specific needs of both groups while allowing them both to expand and develop their proficiency in each of the CLP skills in an integrated manner. Though continuing to maintain an overall academic emphasis, instruction could follow a notional-functional syllabus, thus becoming more problem-centered and task-oriented. This integrated instructional approach to communicative and listening competence is both realistic and feasible.

Though the GRW block better meets the academic needs of the F-1 students, community students will nevertheless be encouraged to enroll because their survival and success in the community or business world demands competency in these skills. Configuration #1 is therefore preferable to #2 and #3 because it assures that all students taking this

block would acquire and develop all these skills. However, since most community students are not likely to choose this block, Configuration #3 would probably be more appealing, perhaps even drawing some community student to the RW block.

There are some advantages to the block arrangement which exceed the obviously convenient and logical groupings:

1. Since the skills in each block are interdependent, they can be isolated or integrated at the discretion of the instructor, and the emphasis will invaribly balance out on a day to day basis.
2. There is more latitude to work with individual students on particular problems or with the entire class on special projects or presentations.
3. Curriculum choices could become easier and more flexible; depending upon the availability of appropriate texts, a block curriculum could utilize only one or several texts.
4. There will be ample time to administer more thoroughly integrated tests.
5. The usual ten-minute break between classes can be more conveniently placed, if necessary.
6. Placement of the GRW blocks in the morning may create a more stimulated and alert class than if it had been placed after lunch. Similarly, the give-and-take between students in the CLP block is less likely to succumb to the mental sluggishness typical of after-lunch hours because students can draw on morning events for conversation starters.

Additional recommendations for changes in the ELI, still to be presented, are easily compatible with the semi-intensive requirement and block arrangement of classes. They complement one another to provide an effective and well-integrated program.

Policies of Admission

Of primary importance to the integrity of the entire ELI program is the strengthening of admission policies even though more stringent policies will necessarily render some students inadmissible. My initial recommendation in this area is that prospective students be first advised through ELI brochures and subsequently at the Admissions desk that the ELI program has an overall academic emphasis requiring out-of-class work and that it is not designed to meet the language needs of the truly beginning learner. Furthermore, prospective students should be advised that they will be required to demonstrate a competency in speaking, reading, and writing which is at least suitable for successful participation at the Beginning level.

F-1 students must be high school graduates; and, although no level of English proficiency is required for F-1 status, most F-1 students have had several years of formal English training (Table 2). Similarly, most of the community students have graduated from high school and have had several years of previous formal English training. Therefore, to require a secondary education and at least two years of high school English for ELI admission is both realistic and appropriate for all students. The secondary education requirement is consistent with practice in the majority of English language programs, and the two-year high school English requirement will virtually preclude those truly beginning

language students, whether F-1 or community, for whom the ELI is not currently intended.

Allowances must be made, however, for those students who meet neither of these requirements but who can demonstrate sufficient competency in English to participate successfully in the program. Such competency could have been acquired through another language program or simply through extensive acquisition and learning opportunities. Further allowances must be made, at the discretion of the Director, for that rare student who meets neither the education nor the competency requirement but exhibits extraordinary initiative, determination, and language aptitude. One such student enrolled in the ELI when it first began and has become an incredible success story.

The resolve to maintain these standards must not continue to succumb to clerical, financial, or administrative expediencies; neither should they succumb to the "influential" and/or insistent sponsor or relative who wishes to have a particular student enrolled despite that student's apparent inadmissibility. Allowing the program to become compromised at the Admissions level will gradually deteriorate its credibility within the local community and overseas.

Recommended Changes in Criteria for Admission:

1. Every student shall be a high school graduate and have at least two years of high school English instruction

and/or

2. shall be required to demonstrate a competency in speaking, reading, and writing which is at least suitable for successful participation in the ELI at the Beginning level.

Policies of Placement

Decisions governing initial placement of a student are critical because they essentially influence that student's participation and progress throughout the entire program. As Brown (1980:111) discovered, those students initially placed at the Beginning level and progressing through the program might not be as proficient at higher levels as those students placed directly at those levels. Admitted ELI students have previously been placed at a particular instructional level on the basis of scores received on the MTELP. Occasionally, however, some community students have not been given the test; this has been either an oversight during a harried Registration Week or because the student obviously lacked sufficient competency to even take the test. Therefore, a standard and consistent procedure must be followed to place every student in the ELI program whether he is part-time, full-time, F-1, or community.

Currently, students receiving an equated MTELP score of 39 or below are placed at the Beginning level along with those students who are clearly incapable of taking the test. Thus the composition of Beginning classes has varied considerably from semester to semester according to where students fall within this wide differential. Narrowing this range could be accomplished by establishing a minimum MTELP score for the Beginning level. However, this will be unnecessary if ELI publicity and the recommended changes in Admissions policy are effective in limiting enrollment to students with a predetermined level of proficiency.

Students having equated MTELP scores of 40-59 have previously

been placed in the Intermediate classes, and those students having equated MTELP scores of 60 and above have been placed in the Advanced classes. According to the ELI Director, these cut-off points have generally proven to be reliable.

However, there have been occasional inconsistencies in the composition of classes because of unequal proficiency in the four skill areas which tends to be obscured by one composite test score. For example, the isolated score from the Listening component of the MTELP may justify placement of a student at a level different from the one indicated by the composite score. Therefore, I recommend that the ELI place students by assessed proficiency in a given skill area. For example, a community student who has had extensive acquisition opportunities may be far more proficient in speaking than he is in grammar, reading, or writing; thus, he would be placed in the Intermediate CLP block and in the Beginning GRW block. Conversely, an F-1 student may be Intermediate in reading and writing skills, but require placement in the Beginning CLP block. Mis-placement can create boredom or frustration which seriously interfere with learning.

More often than not, proficiencies are likely to be within the same general range and the student would be placed at one level in both skill blocks. But, when this is clearly not the case, the student should be placed according to his assessed separate proficiencies. This policy would be more realistic, and subsequent progression/retention decisions would more clearly reflect a student's progress and actual competency.

Therefore, to make the initial placement process more consistent and reliable, I recommend that <u>every</u> student 1) take the MTELP or the

Michigan English Placement Test (MEPT), 2) submit a writing sample on a selected topic, and 3) participate in a structured oral interview. The writing sample would clearly indicate usable vocabulary and grammar patterns not necessarily evident from test results. Since neither the MTELP nor the MEPT are measures of communicative competence, they should be, therefore, administered in conjunction with an assessment which is. The Ilyin Oral Interview is such as assessment and, since it is a structured interview, would be reliable from student to student and semester to semester.

The Illinois ESL/ABE program has utilized a standardized informal interview based upon gathering information for a "student fact sheet" (Escobar 1975:42) (Appendix F). It was originally designed to be given in lieu of a placement test for those students unable to read. This interview, conducted as part of the initial registration process, casually determines usable vocabulary and grammar patterns without bearing the threat of a placement test. Students answer questions about themselves, their family, their work, and their education. Questions are ordered according to grammatical difficulty. I have designed a similar version for ELI use which can subsequently be placed in the student's permanent ELI file (Appendix G). If this "questionnaire" is presented prior to the administration of the ELI placement battery, it would ease "test anxiety" and provide a casual assessment of oral ability, thus indicating whether or not the student would even be capable of taking the MTELP/MEPT or the Ilyin Oral Interview.

A more thorough and consistent placement procedure, in conjunction with placement by assessed separate proficiencies, will

the semester, decisions for progression or retention were made through the collaborative effort of the entire staff.

The fundamental issue in this decision-making process was whether students should be progressed or retained by level or by demonstrated proficiencies in the separate skills. The staff opted to retain or advance students on the basis of their demonstrated proficiencies in the separate skills. Nevertheless, several students clearly deserved to advance to the next level in all classes, while one student warranted retention in all classes on her current level. There were, however, several students who warranted retention in one or two classes. unfortunately, the ELI staff was unable to monitor the results of these decisions because several of these students did not enroll in the Spring semester.

Nevertheless, there was no doubt that the retention decisions made by the staff were justified, but retention was a new consideration and one mixed with many "What if's": What if the retained student objected? What if that student left the program? What if the student could not afford the time or money to delay his educational agenda? What if the sponsor or family objected? What if retention was perceived as "failure" and therefore brought a "loss of face"? From a pedagogical point of view, ELI should have the final say; from an andragogical point of view, however, the students should have the final say. The size of the ELI enrollment does not make it feasible for the ELI to issue "either- - or" ultimatums. The Director can only advise the student of the retention recommendation and of the possibility for failure if he insists on progression. Students cannot be coddled even though they may indeed

be "cherished" (Strevens 1977a:277); ELI students, adult learners, should be allowed the opportunity to fail (or succeed) if they choose to do so.

Many IELP's stipulate that students be retained only once in a given course at a given level. If a student cannot demonstrate a stubstantial gain in proficiency after one more semester, he is dismissed from the program. If the possibility of retention and dismissal were clearly stated in the ELI brochures and during Registration Week, these policies could very well become incentives for progress.

Colleagues have suggested that students who are retained may experience boredom with the same curriculum and would therefore not be motivated to progress. The ELI Director concurred and suggested the use of dual sets of material which could be alternated from semester to semester. A policy of retention does not automatically necessitate this adjustment in curriculum, but the staff and Director are clearly indicating their willingness to make the learning process as creative and productive for the students as possible.

In the revised format, at the end of each semester, students in the GRW blocks would take the MTELP and submit another writing sample. Students registered in the CLP blocks alone would take only the Listening component of the MTELP, while all students in the CLP blocks would participate in an oral interview with one of the instructors. MTELP results provide a reliable assessment of progress when compared to those obtained during the initial placement process. Though more subjective assessments than the MTELP, the writing sample and the oral interview nevertheless provide evidence of what the students can actually do with their acquired language.

Too often, however, assessment of a student's communicative competence through such an interview is limited only to his ability to respond. Though the interview used at the end of the semester was initiated by the instructor and was short, it was nevertheless an unstructured conversation and there was adequate time and opportunity for the student to initiate topic changes or ask questions. Therefore, though an elaborate and very useful rating sheet (Harris 1969:84) was used at the end of the interview to assess oral competency, I recommend that it be amended to reflect the student's effort and ability to initiate and sustain various phases of the conversation (Appendix H).

The actual work done during a semester provides the necessary balance to these other assessments and must continue to be an integral part of the progression/retention process. One of my colleagues, Bernie Blaine, designed a simple "at a glance" progress sheet to record class work and evaluate student progress during the semester (Figure 2). Blaine cleverly designed the form to record each week's work and attendance on a single line. If a student should question a low test grade, for example, Blaine can quickly show him that, prior to the test, his attendance had been irregular and related assignments were not completed. Such a record can be easily read by other instructors as well when the entire staff is collaborating on progression/retention decisions. Furthermore, these progress sheets could be placed in a student's permanent ELI record at the end of each semester to complete a student's progress profile.

A standardized and consistent procedure for determining progression will provide a reliable assessment of proficiency for each student

Figure 2

Student Progress Sheet

Class: _____ Student: _____

Instructor: _____ Semester: _____

Week	ATTENDANCE M	T	W	Th	F	ASSIGNMENTS M	T	W	Th	F	QUIZZES	TESTS
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
10												
11												
12												
13												
14												
15												

Comments

and foster continuity from semester to semester. Therefore, these procedures should be followed for every student and for each semester regardless of enrollment size. Furthermore, progression/retention decisions based upon skill areas better reflect the diverse language needs of the entire ELI enrollment.

Recommended Changes in Progression Policies:

1. Progress or retain students on the basis of their demonstrated proficiency in each of the skill blocks.
2. Base progression/retention decisions for the GRW block on the MTELP, a submitted writing sample, and class work.
3. Base progression/retention decisions for the CLP block on the Listening component of the MTELP, an unstructured oral interview, and class work.
4. Amend the oral interview rating sheet to reflect a student's effort and ability to initiate and sustain various phases of the conversation.
5. Dismiss a retained student from the program if he or she cannot demonstrate a reasonable gain in proficiency after an additional semester in the same course.

Grading System

Consistent with the recommended changes in progression policies is the recommendation that the ELI adopt a "Pass-No Pass" grading policy. Students earning the equivalent of "A," "B," or "C," would receive "Pass" as a semester grade. Those students earning the equivalent of "D" or "F" would receive "No-Pass" as a semester grade.

When I originally considered this area of the ELI program, I was seeking a way to lessen the burden of learning for those students so obviously encumbered by the grading system. I anguished every time I had to give Yang, Luz, or Tadeusz an "F" even though they were progressing from their own personal starting points. These students clearly did not belong in an academic program. Students who do belong in the program are not quite so intimidated with a letter grading system. Yet, I have noticed that F-1 students seem to be more comfortable with it than the community students are.

Nevertheless, I believe a "Pass-No Pass" system is appropriate for the entire enrollment. It would not only alleviate some of the anxiety over the grading issue, but it would also, more importantly, shift the emphasis from acquisition of grades to the acquisition of skills and competency. The "Pass-No Pass" designation could be used for daily work as well as for terminal grades. Graded work or tests could simply bear a "P" or "NP" in addition to the appropriate indication of errors and needed areas of improvement. An "NP" might necessitate a second try on a test or graded exercise.

Highly competitive students might become frustrated, however, without the incentive traditional grades afford, whereas other students might consider the reduced threat to be an added incentive to learning. Therefore, to satisfy both under a "Pass-No Pass" system, I recommend that instructors continue to keep traditional evaluations in a grade book for the benefit of competitive students and for the purpose of submitting names for the APU Honor Roll; although ELI semester grades can place a student on the Honor Roll--and there were eight following the

Fall, 1982 semester, they do not presently count in a student's GPA for graduation purposes.

This recommendation additionally represents a shift from the pedagogical to the andragogical, more accurately reflecting the composition of the ELI enrollment and the diverse learning styles.

Recommended Changes in the Grading System:

1. Adopt a "Pass-No Pass" grading system for all students enrolled in the ELI.

AN ELI ALTERNATIVE

As a result of recommended changes in the external framework and operating policies of the ELI, some prospective students would be essentially precluded from enrollment--some because they would be clearly inadmissible and others because they would not desire the overall academic emphasis or could not comply with a semi-intensive requirement. Two options are currently available for such students. They could be directed to one of the other local language programs or they could be encouraged to enroll in APU's already existing non-academic alternative to the ELI program, "English as a Second Language for Adults," an evening non-credit course operated through the Division of Continuing Education in conjunction with the ELI. Obviously, this latter option is preferable to APU.

Unfortunately, however, students have neither been specifically directed to this program nor has publicity drawn the students for whom it was designed; only a few students have enrolled during the two semesters this course has existed, thus not making it very cost effective.

This course, however, is appropriate for the non-academic and somewhat casual language learner. It meets two evenings a week for 1½ hours and is offered in an 8-week session. There is little out-of-class work and no grades are given; instruction is more individualized than that in the ELI. The course seeks to meet immediate language needs and emphasizes basic survival skills.

Since the ELI easily draws community students to its morning classes, I recommend providing a third option for those students mentioned above--a 3-hour Wednesday morning class, similar in approach and emphasis to the evening class. Furthermore, I recommend that neither this morning class nor the evening class be called "English as a Second Language for Adults." This title implies that the English taught in the ELI is not for adults and/or that those students in the ELI are not adults. A title more descriptive of this course and distinguishable from the ELI program is necessary. Whereas ELI instruction is primarily geared to English for academic purposes, with conversation classes stressing communicative competence and some survival skills, the current evening course is primarily geared to English for social and survival purposes with some necessary instruction in grammar, reading, and writing. "Community English," I believe, would be an appropriate title for this course

"Community English" would essentially be one course with two sections--Tuesday and Thursday evenings for 1½ hours each evening and Wednesday morning for three hours. The morning section offers a viable alternative to the evening section for the following reasons:

1. Community students would only need to arrange their

schedules to include one morning of class time, rather than two evenings, thus drawing those students who have limited time available for language instruction and/or who have evening jobs.

2. Instruction could be group-oriented during the first 1½ hours and individualized during the second 1½ hours.
3. This class could become interrelated to the ELI through the "Split-Week" instructional plan, described below, through which willing and capable ELI students and/or regular APU students could serve as peer tutors during the 1½ hours of individualized instruction time.

A further recommendation is that both sections of this "Community English" course be operated concurrently with the 15-week semester rather than in 8-week sessions. A 3-hour-per-week course offered for 15 weeks is more instructionally advantageous than that same course offered for only 8 weeks. Further, a more productive learning relationship between students and instructors can be established during 15 weeks and can therefore effect more substantial gains in language proficiency.

Both sections of the "Community English" course could draw and absorb those students for whom the ELI is inappropriate, and both could become potential feeders for the ELI program by helping interested students develop competencies at least adequate for participation at the Beginning level of the ELI. Both sections could be operated through the Division of Continuing Education in conjunction with the ELI.

Both the ELI and "Community English" can be operated independently of one another, but to the advantage of each. For either of these

programs to compete for the same students within the same university would be debilitating for both. Both "Community English" and the ELI can claim clearly defined populations and establish goals and objectives which supplement rather than duplicate those of the other program.

The development and support of "Community English," provides an alternative to the ELI which is clearly to the advantage of both students and the university.

A "SPLIT-WEEK" INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Introduction

Frequently, formal intensive language training becomes so text- or class-bound that the advantages of such instruction soon become counter-productive: students' attention is diverted to the clock; class becomes a place to catch up on needed sleep; pencil twirling and fidgeting indicate that instruction has exceeded the brain's capacity to process; students resort to their own native language as soon as class is over; absence and tardiness increase. The materials and format of an intensive program must be varied frequently in order to keep language training meaningful and stimulating; motivation is more important than aptitude in the early stages of second language learning because attitude becomes an important predictor of who will continue language study and acquire proficiency (Izzo 1981:16).

The diversification of instruction through relevant activities and projects or the intermingling of ELI and native-English-speaking students can boost sagging motivation and free students and instructors from occasional classroom tedium. Though the current intensity of 20 to 30 hours per week for full-time ELI students is consistent with

IELP programming elsewhere, I believe that ELI students could occasionally be released from classroom instruction to participation in broader and more stimulating language learning experiences. A "Split-Week" instructional program could accomplish this.

A "Split-Week" program would involve releasing students from class on Wednesday morning from 9:00-12:00 and requiring them to participate in other language learning activities either scheduled for them by instructors or selected by the students themselves. Activities, projects, and exercises could be specifically arranged by and/or for class blocks or individual students. For example, on a given Wednesday morning, all students in the Beginning GRW block could go on a field trip they had planned, while the Intermediate GRW block would have the option of choosing individual tasks from a list of relevant activities appropriate for their proficiency level.

This "Split-Week" program could provide a way to deal effectively with those four areas of the ELI program which students answering Student Survey #1 singled out for change and improvement: the intensity of instruction, the use of the language laboratory, the use of the Learning Resources Center, and the opportunities for socializing between among ELI students and instructors.

Intensity of Instruction

In Fall, 1982, the ELI increased the intensity of its program from three days of instruction per week to five. Gone were those in-between days which could be used for processing, review, and rest. Both students and instructors found that this new schedule strengthened the program, but it also occasionally weakened body and mind. As

previously discussed, several F-1 students indicated on SSI that the intensity of 20 to 30 hours of class per week was making them tired and bored. There is little "let down" time within the current structure when concentration can relax and English can be unconsciously and spontaneously used--for fun; there are, of course, those times at lunch, during breaks, and after class, but these times do not seem to generate the English they could. Because most of the ELI students live in situations where no English is spoken, provision for a variety of meaningful language opportunities on campus is essential.

The "Split-Week" would simply restructure the intensity of the ELI program, not reduce it; students would be expected to "sign in" at 9:00 and confer with their instructor about morning activities. English would be required of all students in all of the activities; language may flow more freely when students are taken out of the classroom and they feel less pressure to "perform."

Though Krashen has implied that formal instruction is a more efficient way of learning English for adults than trying to learn it in "natural" situations (1975:173), Upshur, Mason and Brière have maintained that the use of a second language in informal environments may be more important than formal training (Krashen 1978:257). Nevertheless, Krashen concedes that "to the extent that exposure is more important than instruction, we should reconsider the make-up of our second language programs" (p. 258). The "Split-Week" does seek to create more informal learning situations and more acquisition opportunities by balancing intensive instruction with more diverse opportunities for language use and exposure.

The "Split-Week" could alleviate both the boredom and burnout which students and instructors alike have occasionally experienced in the ELI's intensive program.

Language Laboratory

One student justifiably criticized the non-use of the language laboratory as an integral part of the ELI program. The ELI has not utilized the 15 stations of the laboratory because the present system requires reel-to-reel tapes and a paid monitor. Currently, all the ELI's taped material, compatible with and/or accompanying texts, is on cassettes, and there are no funds available to pay a monitor.

Brochures reviewed for this study indicated that most IELP's integrate independent use of the language laboratory into their required curriculum. If lab work necessitates out-of-class time, it also requires a lab and class schedule which makes such use possible. Most of APU's ELI students do not live on campus and few remain after classes are over; therefore, such lab use in the ELI program would not be feasible unless it was scheduled during class time. The present lab set-up does easily lend itself to class rather than individual use, but none of the staff has been trained to operate the system. We have found, however, that independent and individualized use of class-related cassettes on a take-home basis appears to be a more productive and efficient use of time for students and instructors. Such use could be increased and fostered through the "Split-Week" program coupled with the more extensive use of the Learning Resources Center.

Learning Resources Center

The Learning Resources Center (LRC) is located at the end of the long hall where most ELI students have their classes; it exists as both an enticement and a curiosity to most ELI students. Unfortunately, as indicated on the survey, ELI students have not been "introduced" to this facility. It has slowly and productively evolved from a quiet place to study to a place where students can find reference material, current magazines and newspapers, study aids, advice on how to study, and even tutoring if needed. Monies are currently being sought by the LRC Director for more extensive development of this facility. The LRC would play a key role in the "Split-Week" program by providing the space, materials, and audio-visual equipment to be used by ELI as well as other students.

The LRC could effectively assume the function of a partial language laboratory if several listening stations were installed. Each station could house a cassette recorder with record and play-back capability. Students could then be directed or encouraged to use available tapes for individual or group work; cassette players equipped with several jacks for head-set use could be easily used by several students at one station. The LRC aides could easily monitor this equipment.

Additional stations could house a Language Master for pronunciation practice and reinforcement as well as a video-tape player for viewing and interpreting particular situations or interactions. With video tapes, movies, or film strips, students could make up dialogues appropriate for the situations or interactions depicted, a valuable activity in teaching students how to "read" conversations.

Outside the audio-visual realm, the LRC could provide a file of

problem-solving games and language learning tasks involving one or more students. Furthermore, such games as Scrabble or Boggle could be available for vocabulary recognition and spelling. Reading-enhancement activities could also be provided with SRA kits available for self-pacing. Pearson (1981:413) states that even after university-bound foreign students have completed intensive language training, they nevertheless lack essential reading, writing, and study skills needed for successful academic work. On file in the LRC could also be selected exercises on such study skills as outlining, note-taking, proofreading, and doing research.

As discussed earlier in this study, adults like to be self-directing; use of the LRC would hopefully provide access to a variety of language learning opportunities and available media relevant to the students' own instructional objectives and encourage them to assume more responsibility for their own language learning (Cimerhanzel-Nestlerode 1981).

Interaction Between ELI Students and Teachers

One of the students expressed on SSI that she felt more interaction between ELI students and teachers would be beneficial to the development of conversation and to the cohesion of the entire ELI enrollment. This has long been a concern of the ELI Director and staff; there have been activities planned, but students have either not attended, or they have huddled in their own language groups and not intermingled with other students. One successful activity, however, was a "get-together" between ELI students and students in the Freshman English classes; since these students had simultaneous classes, such a gathering was easy

to arrange. Several students in each group felt awkward and some attempts to intermingle were feeble; however, most students had great success in bridging language barriers and were able to enjoy conversing with one another. This gathering had been prompted by the Freshman English students who had questioned the apparent "isolation" of ELI students from native-speaking students.

In 1972, Savignon compared the communicative competence of three groups of college students learning French, one of which engaged in weekly communicative activities with native-speaking students; though their discrete point tests showed no greater improvement than those of the other two groups, their communicative competence had greatly improved (Friedenberg and Bradley 1981:404). Kessler (1974) suggests scheduling foreign students into classes where they will meet and work with English-speaking students, thus providing them an opportunity to enter the mainstream of college life. Such encounters with APU's non-ELI students is a viable possibility within a "Split-Week" program, especially for the Advanced students. On Wednesday mornings, interested ELI students could either visit or regularly participate in one of the Freshman classes, with the permission of the instructor; they could get to know other APU students and discover how their academic competencies compare. A Physical Education class would foster more conversation opportunities than a History class, but in the latter, students could practice listening and note-taking skills.

Additionally, the more proficient ELI students could act as peer tutors during the individualized instruction of the Wednesday morning

"Community English" course. Their own skills would be enhanced as they instructed other language learners.

A "Split-Week" would also provide time for occasional field trips. Three ELI classes grouped together twice during the Spring semester for field trips: the trip to the museum was followed by eating lunch together at a local restaurant, and the trip to the university library was an exercise in learning how to use the card catalog and locate books throughout the library. The planning for such trips could be part of one Wednesday morning's activities with the trip on a following Wednesday. A three-hour block provides ample time to go on a field trip and have lunch together, or come back early to discuss or write about what was experienced. Such outings generate much related and unrelated dialogue; students forget they they are "learning" English--they just use it. These outings can also expose students to a fuller range of English usage and provide a more global method for motivating the use of all acquired skills. Additionally, both students and instructors can relate to each other on a more equal basis and in a more casual manner; however, though this kind of relationship between students and instructors can be conducive to motivation and learning, it is not always acceptable to or comfortable for those students (and instructors) who prefer to maintain a "respectable" distance.

Working on projects together is another way to stimulate language through interaction and to shift the emphasis from form to function. Students and instructors as well could perform some needed service for the university or community on a one-time or regular basis.

Group tutorials held one a month with native-English speakers

from different parts of the United States could expose students to different accents and speech rhythms (Armanet 1981); such tutorials could center around subjects chosen by the students and involve one or more native-English speakers, either students or non-ELI instructors.

Extensive interaction between and among ELI students and instructors as well as with native-English speakers is possible within the "Split-Week" program. Unfortunately, such interaction is not desired by all language learners and does have some drawbacks. Many adult students resist language learning if their preconceived ideas about learning and teaching methods do not coincide with those of a particular language program. Additionally, many students resist the culture load that accompanies the development of communicative competence; "the pedagogical approach espoused by ESL/EFL teachers in the US appears to be integrative regardless of learners' motives, needs, or drives (Alptekin 1981:277). Those ideas just presented in the preceeding discussion about the possibilities afforded by a "Split-Week" program certainly approach integrative methods.

Not only can an adult language learner remain skeptical about learning language through new methods, he is likely to feel that any kind of integrative activities could entail the denial of his own culture (Paulston 1980:24). But as Brown (1980:158) states, "Second language learning within a second culture is inextricably intertwined with culture learning." This does not, however, mean that language programs have the right or indeed intend to sway instrumentally-oriented students to an integrative orientation; Alptekin specifically cautions against such an

attempt (p. 277). But communicative competence simply cannot develop without communicative activities.

However, there are students who do not care to develop their communicative competence or participate in any integrative activities; the text book, blackboard and classroom create a safe, secure language environment from which they do not wish to venture. "Split-Week" activities could be varied enough to accommodate these students by allowing them quiet individual work relevant to their particular proficiency and needs.

Logistics of a "Split-Week" Program

The smooth and effective operation of this program will require a carefully coordinated schedule, some well-planned logistics, and an enthusiastic team effort on the part of the ELI staff and Director. The proposed block arrangement of classes, in any of the configurations presented, makes the implementation of this program feasible.

All of the students in the morning blocks would participate in the "Split-Week" activities, and those students enrolled only in the CLP blocks could participate as well if their personal schedules allowed. A colleague further suggested that the Wednesday afternoon CLP block could become individualized time as well, thus affording time for needed tutoring or teacher-student conferences. At present, ELI staff members do not have regular office hours during which they can have conferences with students. Such time could be provided during the Wednesday CLP block with those students not in conference or tutoring participating in other assigned learning activities.

Summary

The possibilities of a "Split-Week" program are endless; they are limited only to the imagination of the staff and students within the constraints of time, space, and money. The wishful thinking alluded to at the beginning of this chapter is manifested mostly in this recommended change in the ELI framework. Much of what has been presented is needed by students; much of what has been presented is simply wished for them in order to provide the most enjoyable, effective, and thorough language learning experience the ELI can offer.

CONCLUSION

The focus of this study was to determine ways in which the English Language Institute at Alaska Pacific University could better accommodate the current diversity of students and language needs within its intensive academically-oriented language program. Clearly, a single program cannot, for to do so would truly compromise the program and its efficacy. Therefore, in resolving the situation, two approaches were considered in making recommendations for revision in the ELI: 1) the ELI could change from an academically-oriented program to a non-academically oriented program to better accommodate and draw more students from the local international community; 2) the ELI could maintain its present academic emphasis, limit admission only to those F-1 and community students who could meet specific criteria, and maintain consistent standards for admission, placement, and progression, thus creating a more homogeneously motivated enrollment and essentially requiring students to conform to the ELI program rather than requiring ELI policies to fluctuate with changing enrollments.

The latter approach was assumed and more stringent ELI policies have been recommended; these recommendations, however, do not intend to create a static and inflexible program, but rather a stable and reliable framework within which the dynamics of language learning can take place. Recommendations have suggested revision in the external framework of the ELI program, further development of a non-academic language program at APU to accommodate those learners for whom the ELI is inappropriate, and a restructuring of program intensity through a "Split-Week" approach to instruction. Major recommendations in these areas were the following:

I. ELI operating policies

A. Program intensity: Community students should be required to enroll in a semi-intensive program of 10 to 15 hours per week; to implement this requirement more easily, current classes should be arranged into two or three block courses on each of the three levels. Each block would carry its own title, be accorded a commensurate number of credit hours, and have its own instructor.

B. Admission: All students should be required to have a secondary education and at least two years of high school English; they should also be required to demonstrate competencies in speaking, reading, and writing which are at least suitable for participation in the ELI at the Beginning level.

C. Placement: Students should be placed in a block course according to their assessed proficiencies in block-related skills; unless their proficiencies warrant,

students should no longer be automatically placed at one level of instruction.

D. Progression: Students should be advanced or retained per their demonstrated separate proficiencies in the various skill areas; if retained, students should have only one semester to show reasonable gains in proficiency or be dismissed from the program.

E. Grading: The ELI should adopt a "Pass-No Pass" grading system which better reflects the motivations and learning styles of the ELI's diverse enrollment.

II. An alternative to the ELI

A. The Division of Continuing Education, in conjunction with the ELI, should continue its current non-academic, no-credit, evening ESL course and add a similar section of 3 hours on Wednesday mornings to further accommodate and draw those students for whom the academically-oriented ELI is inappropriate.

B. Furthermore, neither the evening nor the newly added morning section should continue to be called "English as a Second Language for Adults," but rather "Community English," a title which better describes the program and distinguishes it from the ELI.

III. A "Split-Week" instructional program

A. The current intensity of the ELI should be restructured to allow the release of students from classrooms on Wednesday mornings to participate in broader and more

diverse language learning opportunities with other ELI or native-speaking students.

B. These language learning opportunities should include expanded use of audio-visual equipment, individual or group projects, field trips, and group tutorials with native-English speakers.

These policies and the semi-intensive requirement may initially reduce community enrollment, but I believe it will quickly increase as the ELI further establishes itself in the community with a clearly defined and consistent program. Eventually, as the program successfully achieves the objectives of students and instructional personnel, word-of-mouth advertising by students who have completed the program will become the ELI's most effective recruiting device, both within the community and overseas.

An intensive English language program at Alaska Pacific University is vital to the university's international and intercultural posture. APU cannot justify or maintain such an emphasis without drawing and subsequently providing language training for foreign students, students whose own educational goals and achievements can contribute to the overall academic quality of the university. For APU to draw highly motivated and dedicated foreign students, the ELI must firmly establish itself as an effective and credible language program with a strong commitment to accountability. After two years of growth, the ELI has begun to do so. That is why it cannot now compromise itself. Adherence to sound policies and a well-integrated program will provide both the ELI and APU a reputation for excellence.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

STUDENT SURVEY #1--FALL, 1982

STUDENT SURVEY #1

I. Do you have a Student visa? yes_____ no_____

II. Please answer this question by putting the choices in order of their importance to you. Use 1 = the most important reason to me
2 = a very important reason to me
3 = an important reason to me
4 = not a very important reason to me

Why do you want to study English?

___To get a good or better job in the United States.

___To get an education at an American university.

___To communicate better in English with friends, businessmen, neighbors, customer, doctors, teachers, etc.

___Other (You may use your own language or English to explain.)

_____

_____

_____

III. Please write your answers to these questions. You may use your own language or English.

A. Why did you choose the English Language Institute at A. P. U.?

_____

_____

_____

B. What do you like best about the English Language Institute program?

_____

_____

_____

C. What changes do you think would make the English Language Institute program better?

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX B

STUDENT SURVEY #1--SPRING, 1983

ELI STUDENT SURVEY #1

I. Do you have a Student Visa? yes_____ no_____

II. What country are you from?_____

III. Why do you want to study English?

1. To get an education at an American university or college.

(circle one) Important 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not important

2. To get a good or better job in the United States.

(circle one) Important 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not important

3. To communicate better in English with neighbors, friends, businessmen, customers, doctors, teachers, etc.

(circle one) Important 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not important

4. Other: (please explain--in English or your own language)

_____

_____

(circle one) Important 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Not important

IV. Please write your answers. You may use your own language or English.

A. Why did you choose the English Language Institute at A.P.U. instead of another program in Anchorage?

_____

_____

_____

_____

B. What do you like about the English Language Institute program?

_____

_____

_____

C. What changes do you think would make the English Language Institute program better?

No changes_____ Changes:_____

_____

_____

_____

Thank you!!!

APPENDIX C

STUDENT SURVEY #2--FALL, 1982

ELI STUDENT SURVEY #2

I. Name_____

II. Country_____

III. Previous educational experience:

A. Please circle the grade you completed in school

1 2 3 4 5 6 (Elementary) 7 8 (Jr. High) 9 10 11 12 (High School)

B. Did you attend a college or university in your country?

yes_____ (How many semesters did you complete?_____)

no_____

IV. Previous exposure to English:

A. Did you take English in school?

yes_____ (Which schools?_____)

no_____

B. How long have you been in the United States?_____

APPENDIX D

STUDENT SURVEY #2--SPRING, 1983

ELI STUDENT SURVEY #2

I. Name_____

II. Country_____

III. Previous education:

A. Please circle the last grade you completed in school:

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

B. Did you go to a college or university in your country?

no_____

yes_____ How many semesters did you complete?_____

IV. Previous exposure to English:

A. Did you study English in school?

no_____

yes_____ How many years?_____

B. How long have you been in the United States?_____

V. Do you speak or read another language in addition to English and your own language?

no_____

yes____ Which language?_____ (speak_____ read_____)

APPENDIX E

SAMPLE LETTER FOR SOLICITATION OF INFORMATION

Alaska Pacific University
Anchorage, Alaska 99504 907-276-8181

The English Language Institute at Alaska Pacific University has reached that point in its growth which, we feel, necessitates a re-evaluation of entrance requirements, design, and effectiveness. We are therefore soliciting resources specifically dealing with the following areas as they pertain to intensive ESL programs on the university level:

1. entrance requirements
2. policies of progression from one level to another
3. grading schemes
4. credit vs. non-credit for ELI
5. inclusion of students into the program who do not intend to pursue university study

We would appreciate any recommendations, bibliographies, or unpublished surveys you have available in the above areas. Can you suggest any other sources of information which may be of help to us?

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Patricia P. Nichols, Instructor
English Language Institute

A New University for a New World

APPENDIX F

ILLINOIS ESL/ABE STUDENT FACT SHEET

ESL/ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAM

Participant Information Sheet

Institution _____

Interviewer _____ Date _____

A – PERSONAL HISTORY

1. What is your name? _____
2. What is your address? _____
3. What is the date today? _____
4. What is your Social Security No.? _____
5. Do you have a telephone? ___ What is the number? _____
6. Are you married? _____ What is your husband's name (or wife's name)? _____
7. Do you have children? ___ How many? _____
8. When were you born? Month _____ Day _____ Year _____
9. Where were you born? City _____ State _____ Country _____
10. Do you have a car? _____
11. If so, what kind? _____ What is the license number? _____
12. Do you have an Illinois driver's license? _____
13. Where are you employed? _____
14. Are you employed full-time or part-time? _____
15. How long have you worked for your present employer? _____

B – EDUCATIONAL HISTORY

1. Did you go to elementary school? _ Where? _____
   What is the last grade you completed? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
2. Did you go to high school? ___ Where? _____
   What is the last grade you completed? 1 2 3 4
3. Did you go to college? ___ Where? _____
   What is the last grade completed? 1 2 3 4
4. Have you had any other education or training? _____
   What kind? _____ Where? _____
5. Can you read:
   _____ English
   _____ Spanish
   _____ Other
   _____ Not at all
6. Have you ever attended school in the U.S.? ☐ Yes ☐ No
   Where? _____ How long? _____
7. How long have you been in the U.S.? _____

APPENDIX G

ELI STUDENT FACT SHEET

1. What is your name?_____
2. Where are you from?_____
3. What is your address in Alaska?_____
4. What is the date today?_____
5. Do you have a Student Visa?_____
6. Do you have a telephone?_____ What is the number?_____
7. Do you have a Social Security Number?_____ What is it?_____
8. Are you married?_____ What is the name of your wife or husband?
   _____ Is he/she here in Alaska?_____
9. Do you have any children?_____ How many?_____
10. When were you born? Month_____ Day_____ Year_____
11. Where were you born? City_____ Country_____
12. Do you have a car?_____ Kind?_____ License #_____
13. Do you have an Alaskan driver's license?_____
14. Do you have a job?_____ Where?_____
15. Do you work full-time or part-time?_____
16. Did you go to elementary school?_____ What is the last grade you completed? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
17. Did you go to high school?_____ What is the last grade you completed? 9 10 11 12
18. Did you go to college?_____ How many semesters?_____
19. Did you study English in school?_____ How many years?_____
20. How long have you been in the United States?_____
21. Do you speak or read another language in addition to English and your own language?_____

APPENDIX H

ELI CONVERSATION EVALUATION

ELI Conversation Evaluation December 17, 1982

Student _____

Rater _____

Conversation Class Fall 1982 (Circle one) 071 081 091

COMMENTS

Pronunciation

_____5. Has few traces of foreign accent
_____4. Always intelligible, though one is conscious of a definite accent.
_____3. Pronunciation problems necessitate concentrated listening and occasionally lead to misunderstanding.
_____2. Very hard to understand because of pronunciation problems. Must frequently be asked to repeat
_____1. Pronunciation problems so severe as to make speech vertually unintelligible.

Grammar

_____5. Makes few (if any) noticeable errors of grammar or word order.
_____4. Occasionally makes grammatical and/or word-order errors which do not, however, obscure meaning.
_____3. Makes frequent errors of grammar and word order which occasionally obscure meaning.
_____2. Grammar and word-order errors make comprehension difficult. Must often rephrase sentances and/or restrict himself to basic patterns.
_____1. Errors in grammar and word order so severe as to make speech virtually unintelligible.

Vocabulary

_____5. Use of vocabulary and idioms is virtually that of a native speaker.
_____4. Sometimes uses inappropriate terms and/or must rephrase ideas because of lexical inadequacies.
_____3. Frequently uses the wrong words; conversation somewhat limited because of inadequate vocabulary.
_____2. Misuse of words and very limited vocabulary make comprehension quite difficult.
_____1. Vocabulary limitations so extreme as to make conversation virtually impossible.

Fluency

_____5. Speech as fluent and effortless as that of a native speaker.
_____4. Speed of speech seems to be slightly affected by language problems.
_____3. Speed and fluency are rather strongly affected by language problems.
_____2. Usually hesitant; often forced into silence by language limitations.
_____1. Speech is so halting and fragmentary as to make conversation virtually impossible.

Comprehension

_____5. Appears to understand everything without difficulty.
_____4. Understands nearly everything at normal speed, although occasional repetition may be necessary.
_____3. Understands most of what is said at slower-than-normal speed with repetitions.
_____2. Has great difficulty following what is said. Can comprehend only "social conversation" spoken slowly and with frequent repetitions.
_____1. Cannot be said to understand even simple conversational English.

Recommended Conversation Course Spring 1983. 071 081 091

ELI

CONVERSATION EVALUATION

Conversations should last between 5 and 10 minutes so that you have time to complete an evaluation form immediately following the interview.

The form of the interview can be relatively unstructured and can flow naturally. Topics might, however, include:

Family
Previous education
Hobbies, sports enjoyed
How to do or make something which is mentioned
Adjustment to the U.S. and to Alaska
  What has been hardest to get used to?
  What have you enjoyed most? Least?
  What do you wish could be different?
Holiday plans
An exciting trip or experience the student has had recently
Future, career plans
Their comments on and assessment of the program, their studies, their level of proficiency

REFERENCE LIST

Alptekin, Cem. 1981. Sociopsychological and pedagogic considerations in L2 Acquisition. TESOL Quarterly 15: 275-282.

Angebis, Paul J. 1982. Testing and evaluation. In Ralph P. Barrett, ed., The administration of intensive English language programs, pp. 81-87. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Armanet, C.M. and K. Obese-Jecty. 1981. Towards student autonomy in the learning of English as a second language at university level. English Language Teaching Journal 36: 24-28.

Barrett, Ralph P., ed. 1982. Introduction. The administration of intensive English language programs, pp. 1-5. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Bensler, David P. and Renate A. Schulz. 1979. Intensive foreign language courses. Language in education: Theory and practice, no. 18. Arlington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. ERIC Document ED 176 587.

Bodman, Jean W. and Susan C. Lanzano. 1978. What ESL students want: A report of their opinions on coping skills in the classroom. Paper presented at 12th annual convention of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). ERIC Document ED 180 209.

Bowen, J. Donald. 1977. Practice effect in English proficiency testing. In H. Douglas Brown, et al, On TESOL '77--Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends in research and practice, pp. 295-309. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1980. The optimal distance model of second language acquisition. TESOL Quarterly 14: 157-164.

Brown, James. 1980. Newly placed students vs continuing students: comparing proficiency. In Janet Cameron Fisher, et al, eds., On TESOL '80--Building Bridges, pp. 111-119. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Buckingham, Thomas. 1981. Needs assessment in ESL. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. ERIC Document ED 208 679.

Canzano, Phyllis Marrell and Dorthea Marrell Canzano. 1974. A practical guide to multi-level modular ESL. Portland: English Language Services. ERIC Document ED 182 975.

Cheng, Helen Ngai-lung. 1980. Learning and performing: An integrated language course at the tertiary level. Paper presented at conference of Japan Association of Language Teachers. ERIC Document ED 207 338.

CIEP English proficiency chart. 1981. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Cimerhanzel-Nestlerode, Samye Ruth Mott and James Cooper. 1981. Individualizing instruction in college-level Spanish: A study of student achievement and attitude. Paper presented at annual meeting of Southwest Educational Research Association. ERIC Document ED 203 723.

Cummins, Jim. 1980. The cross-lingual dimension of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal-age issue. TESOL Quarterly 14: 175-187.

Daesch, Richard L. 1982. The general administration of the intensive English program. In Ralph P. Barrett, ed., The administration of intensive English language programs, pp. 7-9. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Dakin, Robert F. 1982. The selection of intensive English students. In Ralph P. Barrett, ed., The administration of intensive English language programs, pp. 11-18. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

de Leon, Victor, et al. 1981. Basic skills programs at the City University of New York: English as a second language. New York: City University of New York. ERIC Document ED 207 074.

Escobar, Joanna and John Daugherty. 1975. Manual for developing and implementing the ESL/ABE program, book 2. Arlington Heights: Bilingual Education Service Center.

Farhady, Hossein. 1979. Test bias in language placement examinations. In Carlos Yorio, Kyle Perkins, and Jacquelyn Schachter, eds., On TESOL '79--The learner in focus, pp. 162-170. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

____. 1982. Measures of language proficiency from the learner's perspective. TESOL Quarterly 16: 43-59.

Findley, Charles A. and Lynn A. Nathan. 1980. Functional language objectives in a competency-based ESL curriculum. TESOL Quarterly 14: 221-231.

Friedenberg, J. and S.H. Bradley. 1981. Communication skills for the adult ESL student: A microcounseling approach. TESOL Quarterly 15: 403-411.

Gewirtz, A. 1979. Resource-based learning and class organization for adult EFL learners. English Language Teaching Journal 33: 176-183.

Harris, David P. 1969. Testing English as a second language, p. 84. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Ilyin, Donna. 1976. Ilyin Oral Interview. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Ingram, D.E. 1979. Performance-based approach to the measurement of second language proficiency. Paper presented at annual congress of Applied Linguistics Association of Australia. ERIC Document ED 189 853.

Izzo, Suzanne. 1981. Second language learning: A review of related studies. Rosslyn: InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.

Johns, A.M. 1981. Necessary English: A faculty survey. TESOL Quarterly 15: 51-57.

Judd, E.L. 1981. Language policy, curriculum development and TESOL instruction: A search for compatibility. TESOL Quarterly 15: 59-66.

Kertis, Joan, ed. 1982. English language and orientation programs in the United States. New York: Institute of International Education.

Kessler, Carolyn. 1974. Developing an ESL program in a small two-year college. Paper presented at ATESL Section of NAFSA Conference. ERIC Document ED 139 253.

Knowles, Malcolm. 1973. The adult learner: A neglected species. Houston: Gulf Publishing. ERIC Document ED 084 368.

Kounin, Teresa E. and Stephen D. Krashen. 1978. Approaching native speaker proficiency from two different directions. In Charles H. Blatchford and Jacquelyn Schachter, eds., On TESOL '78--EFL policies, programs, practices, pp. 205-212. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Krahnke, Karl J. 1981. Incorporating communicative instruction into academic preparation ESL curricula. Paper presented at annual TESOL summer meeting. ERIC Document ED 210 915.

Krashen, S.D. 1978. How important is instruction? English Language Teaching Journal 32: 257-261.

Lydon, James. 1981. Training project for teachers of adult ESL students. Trenton: Trenton State College. ERIC Document ED 211 699.

Mason, C. 1971. The relevance of intensive training in EFL for university students. Language Learning 21: 197-204.

Monshi-Tousi, Mohammed, Azar Hossiene-Fatemi and John W. Oller, Jr. 1980. English proficiency and factors in its attainment: A case study of Iranians in the United States. TESOL Quarterly 14: 365-372.

Northcutt, Norvell. 1977. The adult performance level study: Final report. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin. ERIC Document ED 185 113.

Oller, John. 1979. Intelligence, achievement, competency, or language. In Carlos Yorio, Kyle Perkins, and Jacquelyn Schachter, eds., On TESOL '79--The learner in focus, pp. 40-66. Washington, D.C.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Ostler, Shirley E. 1980. Survey of academic needs for advanced ESL. TESOL Quarterly 14: 489-502.

Paulston, Christina Bratt. 1980. English as a second language. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.

Pearson, C.R. 1981. Advanced academic skills in the low-level ESL class. TESOL Quarterly 15: 413-123.

Peck, Sabrina. 1979. Differing needs of ESL students. In Marianne Celce-Murcia and Lois McIntosh, eds., Teaching English as a second or foreign language, pp. 261-269. Rowley: Newbury House Publishers, Inc.

Phillips, M.K. and C.C. Shettlesworth. 1978. How to arm your students: A consideration of two approaches to providing materials for ESP. ELT Documents, pp. 23-35. London: The British Council, English-Teaching Information Centre. ERIC Document ED 176 542.

Pimsleur, Paul. 1980. How to learn a foreign language. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher, Inc.

Rivers, Wilga M. 1964. The psychologist and the foreign language teacher. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Robinett, Betty W. 1977. Guidelines: English language proficiency. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Saltzer, Milton G. 1982. The evaluation of an intensive English program. In Ralph P. Barrett, ed., The administration of intensive English language programs, pp. 89-98. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs.

Selman, Mary. 1981. English as a second language for adults: A curriculum guide. Victoria: British Columbia Department of Education. ERIC Document ED 210 455.

Strevens, Peter. 1977a. Causes for failure and conditions for success in the learning and teaching of foreign languages. On TESOL '77--Teaching and learning English as a second language: Trends and practices. 267-277.

____. 1977b. New orientations in the teaching of English. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tharu, J. 1973. Rationalizing the pass-fail decision: A first step in examination reform. CIEFL Bulletin 9: 41-58. ERIC Document 185 864.

Valette, Rebecca M. 1980. In Frank M. Grittner, ed., Learning a second language, pp. 150-167. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

VITA

Patricia Diane Palmer Nichols was an adjunct faculty member in the English Language Institute for two years while also pursuing her Masters Degree in Bilingual and Multi-Ethnic Education at Alaska Pacific University.

While attending college at the University of California at Santa Barbara in 1965, she began training for a Peace Corps assignment to teach English as a Second Language in Thailand. A year later, she graduated with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Sociology, but an accident prevented her from beginning the assignment with the Peace Corps. She returned to northern California where she took further ESL training for a California State Teaching Credential with the designated purpose of teaching ESL to adults.

In 1968, she married Douglas Nichols, a pilot in the United States Air Force, and they were stationed in Taiwan. There, she was an Associate Professor in the Department of Western Language and Literature at Tunghai University in Taichung and taught ESL for two years. After the arrival of her first child, she taught ESL in an Adult Education program at Fung Ja College in Taichung. During the five years in Taiwan, she studied Mandarin Chinese at the Taichung branch of the Taipei Language Institute.

After having returned to the United States in 1973 with her husband and two children for a new assignment in Montgomery, Alabama, she was able to continue her ESL work in tutoring newly arrived Vietnamese refugees. Another assignment in 1976 to San Antonio, Texas, afforded her

tutoring opportunities in the elementary bilingual program; there was further opportunity for tutoring when two Cambodian refugees arrived in New Braunfels, the small rural community where the Nichols' lived.

Work on her Masters Degree was begun at the University of Texas in San Antonio in 1978 and completed at Alaska Pacific University in 1983 after her husband received an assignment to Elmendorf Air Force Base in Anchorage, Alaska.